Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

MORALE FOR MAY DAY

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ARTICLES BY

HARRY POLLITT

IVOR MONTAGU

J. R. CAMPBELL

P. G. BARSTOW, M.P.

BEN BRADLEY

D. F. SPRINGHALL

W. GALLACHER, M.P.

QUÆSTOR

DOLORES IBARRURI

Book Reviews by

D. F. S.

LEN POWELL

MAY 1942 VOL. 24 No. 5

6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount received during April, 1942 : £70 : 11 : 11

THERE IS AN INCREASING and very welcome tendency on the part of postal subscribers to send us Treasury notes (sometimes even for £1) and quite large cheques in payment of their subscriptions, with the brief note, "Please keep the change," enclosed. We hope this practice will continue and expand, although it is not the equivalent of a regular monthly gift. We are glad that you, guarantors and donation-givers, have been just able to lift us out of the sixties ; but while all money is good, there is a great deal of difference between seventy and a hundred.

We are unable to hire the pen of a sob-sister or tear-jerker to cajole your money from your pockets, but the need is none the less urgent, not only this month or next month, but every month. We have certainly received some very sweet-smelling bouquets : "One cannot help being lyrical over the inspiring events for which you and yours are responsible." "It is the journal which carries Marxism—and living Marxism—to the people." "It equips me greatly in these days of political argument." "I want to express my appreciation of the new form of the LABOUR MONTHLY and, of course, the subject-matter is always an inspiration." Even inspiration has to be fed. Please help to feed ours!

	£	s.	d.
R. Pearson		2	6
J. Head		4	0
S. Berry	1	0	0
E. Connington		2	0
Royston Green		2	6
A. C. I.		5	0
H. A. F.		10	0
J. Porter		6	0
Back Pay	10	0	0
E. P.	4	0	0
J. Martin		3	0
Red Corporal	2	0	0
A. Addy		5	0
R. R., N.W.11		10	0
R. F. Braybrook		5	0
A. Bowen		2	0
R. V. Hall	1	0	0
Farnborough D.G.	1	10	0
E. C. Shell		2	6
Tonyrefail D.G.		5	0
Hebburn Sympathisers		2	6
Clifton D.G.		3	0
J. C. Walker		3	0
T. G. Bonner		3	0
G. E. Clayton		3	0
Horsham D.G.		1	0
N. Watford D.G.		4	0
D. I. P. Rees		10	0
R. Ward		10	0
N. Kensington D.G.	1	0	0
Enfield W. D.G.		7	6
P. Cogan		8	0
Aberdeen D.G.		3	0
Batley D.G.		6	7
H. Evans		6	6
Tylorstown D.G.		6	0
Bankhead D.G.		5	0
Twickenham D.G.		5	0
A. Wall		5	0
F. D. Kelsey		2	0
M. Murray	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
G. F. Burn		5	0
D. A. J. Smith		3	0
Edinburgh D.G.		10	0
F. Overington		2	0
Pinner D.G.		9	5
Biddulph D.G.		10	0
H. B. Morton		3	0
D. Gottler		2	6
Northallerton D.G.		1	0
E. J. O. Barnes		3	10
A. Idle		7	0
E. Goldsworthy		3	0
Edgware D.G.		5	0
M. W.		2	6
J. B. Chelmsford		5	0
N. Chingford D.G.	1	0	0
J. Sinclair		13	0
T. S. Price		3	0
5 Red Artillerymen		7	3
Alfreton D.G.		19	0
Amersham D.G.		1	8
J. Anderson		2	6
W. F. Lakin-Smith		2	0
Nuneaton D.G.		5	0
Putney D.G.		10	0
J. A. Duncan		1	6
J. B. Pratt		5	6
Jane		10	0
Gruzya Uchitiellya		18	6
Derby D.G.		2	6
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0
W. G. Frost		13	0
M. Howley		2	6
F. L.		4	6
Red Infantryman		10	0
D. Robinson		2	6
J. McDonald		3	0
J. Conway	1	5	0
W. O. Parsley		8	4
M. Mitchell		10	6
Q. Z.		4	0

	£	s.	d.
M. King		3	0
R. H. Baker		3	0
S. Chidlow		3	0
A. R. M.		5	0
Forest Gate D.G.		5	0
T. J. Despicht		2	6
F. Cattram		2	3
C. L. Watson		14	0
2nd Socialist Sailor	5	0	0
G. C. Havill		2	6
J. V. Earle		13	0
J. B. S. Lewis		13	0
A. J. A.		5	0
J. B. & W. H. T.	5	0	0
A. Isaacs		2	6
Enfield D.G.		8	0
Red Gunner	1	0	0
Beaconsfield D.G.		7	6
A. Currie		5	0
D. Browett		3	0
J. Schloss		13	0
J. H. Garner			10
T. Horlock		3	0
H. Whiteley		3	0
C. G. Roberts		8	0
Winchmore Hill D.G.		10	0
W. D.		10	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. R., N.W.3	1	0	0
Woodford D.G.		5	0
J. Fernie, Jr.		8	0
Chiswick D.G.		3	0
Royston Green		2	6
M. P.	1	0	0
F. Pawson		2	0
Yarmouth D.G.		5	6
Corporal		5	0
C. Walker		13	0
J. P. Carruthers		1	3
R. F. B.	2	0	0
Muriel & Elizabeth		5	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Hold the Key to Victory

by HARRY POLLITT

We regret that the Editor has been prevented by temporary indisposition from writing the "Notes of the Month" in this number. They will be resumed as usual in the June issue.

THE month of May finds opening out the most decisive battles in the world struggle against fascism. It also finds the people of Britain in the most critical and determined mood that we, too, are going to play a decisive part and end the whole policy of "Too late and too little." The people are demanding deeds and victories, not excuses and defeats. They are ready to do what is required of them. The demoralisation that has seized certain sections of the ruling class finds no echo in their ranks. This is the reason for the expression of such deep discontent against the policy of the Government—in the Press, in Parliament, at public meetings, and in by-elections—and for the rapid growth in the public demand for the opening of the Second Front, a strengthening of the alliance with the Soviet Union, the winning of India as a powerful ally, and a stronger Government in Britain.

MORE and more is the Second Front recognised as the key to victory. While sections of the ruling class now seem a little uncertain as to who is the main enemy in this world war, and where the main blows have to be struck, the common people are in no doubt whatever. They know it is Hitlerite Germany, and they also realise that the only place where it can be finally and completely destroyed is on the Continent of Europe. This is why, although they have no illusions about the serious strengthening of the whole political and military basis of Axis fascism that has resulted from Japan's successes over Britain and America in the Pacific, there has been nothing like the same concern over this as over the collapse of France in 1940, and the threats to Moscow and Leningrad last summer and autumn. The Government may find this a little difficult to understand, but the sooner they do understand it, the sooner the necessary adjustments in the whole policy and conduct of the war will be made.

THERE is growing resentment of all the Press talk about "Hitler's gigantic spring offensive," while none of any kind seems to be being organised by Britain. The common people are aware of the successes of the Red Army, and their political repercussions throughout Europe, as seen in the growth of opposition to Hitler, both in the occupied countries and Hitlerite Germany itself. They understand that the new repressive measures directed against the masses on the Continent of Europe, the attack on the Bishops in Norway, and the changes in the Vichy Government are proofs of this new awakening and active rising.

Vol. XXIV. No. 5. CONTENTS FOR MAY May, 1942

		Page
We Hold the Key to Victory	*by* HARRY POLLITT	129
Morale for May Day	*by* IVOR MONTAGU	135
Labour's Crisis and Opportunity	*by* J. R. CAMPBELL	139
The Problem of Labour Unity	*by* P. G. BARSTOW, M.P.	143
India Threatened	*by* BEN BRADLEY	144
Fifty Thousand Communists	*by* D. F. SPRINGHALL	148
Victory and the German People	*by* W. GALLACHER, M.P.	150
Turkey and the U.S.S.R.	*by* QUAESTOR	154
Jose Diaz	*by* DOLORES IBARRURI	158
Book Reviews—		
Heroes of the Atlantic	*by* D. F. S.	160
Give Us the Tools	*by* LEN POWELL	160

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE common people can no longer be fobbed off with airy promises about "passing from the defensive to the offensive in the near future." They are demanding action now. They also see through the various explanations that are trotted out from time to time as to why it is not possible to organise the Second Front. They know that once the political conviction was held by the Government, then everything possible would be done to see that the Second Front was organised, that no obstacle of any kind would be allowed to stand in the way. The ships, men, munitions and aircraft would all be found.

IT is desperately urgent and necessary that the masses compel the Government to get this political conviction as quickly as possible. The Government must be given to understand that they have now to deal with a politically enlightened people, one which has learned a very great deal in the school of bitter experience and defeat, but also a lot more than is realised from the role that the Soviet Union has played in the life and death struggle against fascism.

DURING the Cardiff East by-election the Government candidate stated "that we must help Russia to survive this summer." That is a disgraceful misrepresentation of the issue. We must organise the Second Front so that *we in Britain* can survive as a free people and a free nation. The common people are ashamed to notice in London's Tubes an advertisement appealing for funds for the Soviet Union which reads "They fight for you. Help them to keep on fighting." They are ashamed because they, too, want to be fighting against the Nazis in Europe.

THE defeats in Hongkong, Malaya and Singapore were alleged to be due to our absence of aeroplanes and tanks. Yet when the people demand that production shall be better organised, Government leaders never tire of telling us that we have more than parity with Hitlerite Germany. It is now alleged that we cannot open the Second Front because we have not yet got the necessary production. When the offensive against Rommel opened in Libya, the Prime Minister told the world that at last we were going to fight against Hitlerite Germany on equal terms. There has been no interruption in production in Britain through air raids for a year, but we are constantly assured of the great damage inflicted on Hitler's production by the continued raids carried out by the Royal Air Force in Hitlerite Germany and the occupied countries. When Soviet Ambassadors or British, Canadian, Polish and French generals call for a Second Front, when public pressure of all kinds becomes more vehement in demanding the Second Front, then the leader of the Parliamentary Labour Party, Arthur Greenwood, M.P., rushes into the Camrose Press to chide all and sundry for being romantic in demanding this vital front, when the production to equip it is not there.

THEN where is it? Mr. Bevin seems to have no doubt of the great new success of our productive effort. The people have read of the great new factories, the long hours of work, the intensive effort that employers and workmen alike have been making for years now, of the vast supplies sent from America under the Lease Lend Act. Millions upon millions of pounds are asked for in Parliament and freely granted for production. No concrete facts are given as to whether what has been produced has been lost in any battles comparable to those that have been fought on the Eastern Front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE public are led to believe that we have been short of tanks and aeroplanes in Libya and the Pacific because of what we have sent to the Soviet Union. It is necessary to be clear on this point. There can be no doubt that every effort has been made to fulfil the pledge given in our name by Lord Beaverbrook last October. But a very great deal of material that is popularly supposed to have gone direct to the Red Army has in fact gone to Iran for use by the British forces, because there was a mistaken belief that the Red Army would not be able to defend the oilfields of the Caucasus.

WE therefore ask again—if we have not got the production, where is it, and who is going to be shot for us not having it? We are fully agreed that everything possible needs to be done to increase production. In fact, the Communist Party has published the only constructive and comprehensive plan on production that is before the public. A summary of this plan recently appeared in LABOUR MONTHLY, and it is not necessary to outline it again. We will do everything in our power to sweep aside every obstacle that stands in the way of the maximum output being achieved, from whatever quarter these obstacles may arise, but we refuse to accept the alibi for no Second Front that we have not yet produced enough munitions to make it possible.

AT other times it is said that we must preserve all that we can to fight against any attempt at invasion. This is a favurite trick that has been worked many imes since 1940. Surely it is clear that he best investment against invasion of ritain would be to open a Second Front n the West so as to strike simultaneous lows against Hitler alongside those now eing inflicted by the Red Army. The ressure on Bulgaria and the new demands n Vichy France are in themselves the proof of how desperate Hitler's position in Europe is becoming. If now we attack in the West he would be compelled to withdraw many divisions from the Eastern Front, readjust the whole line of his communications, and face what so far he has avoided—war on two fronts in Europe. Once Hitler had to face this, then the entire political and military situation throughout Europe as a whole would change. Millions of people in the occupied countries would find a way to support a British-Soviet offensive. This would be worth many air squadrons and armoured divisions. It would also dislocate Hitler's production. We could wrest important industrial centres in Europe from his control, and the workers there would be only too glad to produce for freedom instead of their present enforced subjection. We could wrest important aerodromes from Hitler's grasp and then use them not only to destroy his armies, but as bases from which to bomb and destroy Hitler's decisive war industries in his own country. It is clear that the first cracks have begun to appear in the morale of the German people, and they, too, would find the way of playing their part in helping to bring about the defeat of Hitler, once the joint offensive of the British and Soviet armies was organised.

THERE is also another further important consideration to bear in mind. It is this. Once the Second Front was organised all the deep sense of frustration that is now felt in the war industries, and in the armed forces, would disappear. The fact that what was being produced was at last being used for direct blows against the Nazis in Europe would evoke a terrific response in every mine, shipyard and factory, on the railways and at the docks. The tanks, guns, shells, planes, ships and coal would be produced with a rapidity, efficiency and quality that would keep amply supplied our own armies in Europe and at the same time

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fulfil every requirement of the Red Army. It would transform the entire situation amongst millions of the armed forces in Britain and abolish the "browned off" feelings that it is common knowledge exist on a serious scale throughout them.

IT is not the people who are afraid of what a Second Front would demand from them. It is the Government who refuse to organise both the people and the Second Front that they demand. The people who faced all the terrible blitzes, who are ready to tighten their belts, who have supported every measure that has been proposed as necessary for the war effort, whose sons and daughters have been gladly given to the armed forces, whose home life has been broken up to permit production to be increased—they will not hesitate to make still greater sacrifices once the call is made. For they want victory over fascism, and they want it this year. They want to emulate the deeds of the Soviet people. They want to use the key to victory that they believe lies in our hands.

WHENEVER the Government announces there has been a Commando Raid, there is an entirely different atmosphere that morning in workshop, street and bus. But the people do not want these raids to be the diversion from a Second Front. They do not want to listen to broadcasts calling on French workers to face death, to sabotage war production in France while we hesitate to organise a Second Front that could annihilate the Nazis who occupy France.

ALL over Europe suffering men and women are fighting back at the Nazi terror that holds them down, tortures them, starves them and tries to turn all Europe into one vast concentration camp. What deeds of heroism the guerillas in Yugoslavia have performed! The deathless example of Gabriel Peri, not in the heat and excitement of battle when the blood is up and there is a chance of having a smack back, but in the cold light of dawn, to hold head erect and to die living up to Lenin's dedication of a life spent without regret. Or the young Soviet girl who called out just before being executed by the Nazis, "It is a great happiness to die for one's people." The British people know of these deathless deeds, these miracles of sacrifice, and they are roused by them to a readiness to acquit themselves on the same heroic scale and in the same ardent manner, not to save the Soviet Union, but to save themselves, their families, their homes and their country. Major Gribble, the Military Correspondent of the *News Chronicle*, expressed a very widespread feeling when, on April 14, writing in that newspaper in support of the opening of a Second Front, he stated :—

> Opportunity is here. An opportunity which will not be repeated for gaining a quick decision. The coming months should see large-scale Allied offensive action in the West, if the spirit of England lives and is still to live and the name of Britain to be honoured among the nations.

THIS is what is at stake. This is why at all costs, and whatever personalities are involved, the Government must be compelled to organise the Second Front, and to do so whatever withdrawals have to be made in other theatres of war. For whatever temporary losses may have to be experienced on those fronts, once Hitler is defeated, then the combined might of Britain, the Soviet Union, America, China and India will soon put paid to the other two fascist jackals, Japan and Italy.

NOTHING would do more to strengthen the alliance with the Soviet Union than the opening of a Second Front, for our strategy, resources and perspective would then be identical; we would feel and act the same; we would build up such an alliance in the common fight as would achieve three important political consequences. First, it would inspire revo

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against Hitler all over Europe. Second, it would convince the German people that we were not fighting to overthrow Hitler in order to crown Vansittart, and thus would encourage them to give every form of assistance in the fight against Hitler. Third, it would ensure that the alliance would be so strong, so united that it would be capable of solving the many problems that peace will inevitably bring.

ENDING the present impasse in India by freely granting the Indian people the right to form an Indian National Government with full control over the whole resources of their mighty country would guarantee that Japan could be decisively held by India's millions, while Britain took its main place in the struggle against fascism in Europe.

IT will take a bold leadership to carry through this policy, and this is why the demand for the strengthening of the Government must be intensified. The Government must become based on real national unity, embodying the most capable and determined opponents of fascism and staunch supporters of a powerful Anglo-Soviet alliance. To such a Government the working class will give its fullest support, backed up by their deeds in workshop and on battlefield.

THE workers will never bend the knee. The Nazis thought they could conquer the world; but the first time they came up against the working class in power—in the Soviet Union—they got the biggest thrashing in their lives. Their onward march was stopped and the bully of the world began to whine like a spoilt child. The workers in Britain are made of the same mettle as their Soviet comrades; their power and strength, their ability and initiative, their unity and confidence are only waiting to be used to the full. Do not let us wait until an even heavier price has to be paid for delaying to lead and organise the working people.

THIS year's May Day demonstrations must stand for Unity, for Unity also spells Victory. We cannot obtain the same kind of moral and political unity as they have in the Soviet Union because of the difference of social systems, but we can obtain a far stronger and more indestructible national unity than exists at the present time. Only a Victory policy can command such a unity, but the fight for such a policy in itself becomes the instrument through which unity can be forged in the process of the fight.

THIS is why, in the first place, the unity of the Labour Movement is so essential. This is the lynch pin; upon this everything depends for final success. We hope that May Day will bring all sections of the Labour Movement closer together than they have ever been—closer even than we were on the historic May Day of 1926, when we thought the greatest crisis of all time had come to Britain. The times are more serious now. Life and the destiny of humanity are at stake.

THE National Conference of the Communist Party is being held in May, and immediately following it will be that of the Labour Party. These two great conferences can play a tremendous part in strengthening not only the unity of the Labour Movement, but the unity of the whole people. It is not the Tory Party that represents the rock of salvation for the British people, but the Labour Movement.

WE hope that the Labour Party Conference will be ready to take the initiative in trying to develop all forms of united action throughout the Labour Movement. If it were to do so, it would result in a transformation from the passivity that has fallen upon so many sections of the Labour Party to great mass activity. Joint meetings, demonstrations and conferences could be organised and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exchange of fraternal delegates. Local, divisional and national campaigns of all kinds in support of achieving the victory over fascism could be initiated. The trade unions, co-operatives, Labour and Communist Parties would all be strengthened, and the whole perspective for winning the war and the peace immeasurably enhanced. It would give a new hope to millions of people outside the Labour Movement who are now awakening to political consciousness. It would stiffen and strengthen the unity and morale of the entire nation, so that the determination to win, at whatever personal cost, would become one of the strongest weapons in our armoury of Victory.

WE of the Communist Party are ready to respond. We will allow nothing to stand in the way of such a unity being achieved.

ON May Day, 1942, let us all pledge ourselves anew to the sacred cause of internationalism. On this day, when the world is in arms against the vile creed of fascism, we salute those who have been wounded, killed and bereaved in the struggle against the forces of barbarism, terror and oppression. We salute those who are in the front ranks of the fight wherever they may be, and whoever they are. We greet the peoples of all lands, of all creeds, race, colour or religion, who have taken up arms in the most sacred cause which it is the proud mission of Internationalism to carry to triumph.

IN very truth the peoples of all lands who are animated with hatred of fascism are at last united. It is a unity that will stand us in good stead in the peace we shall win. It is a unity that will last and endure. It is a unity forged out of the blood and furnace of war, out of the want and privation of starved peoples, out of the atrocities which have left indelible marks on the bodies of so many innocent peoples in Europe and Asia alike, out of the grandeur of the heroism of those who have fought and those who are still fighting under conditions of appalling difficulty.

MAY we all be inspired with a new sense of the righteousness of our cause, a new conception of our duty, an understanding that every day is precious in organising the victory over fascism in 1941, and that it can only be done by opening the Second Front; strengthening the alliance with the Soviet Union; allowing India to form its own National Government; and strengthening the Government and the national unity of our own country. Then we shall all feel stronger and more united. Then sacrifice will be ennobled with a new willingness and majesty, and the common cause go forward to triumph.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morale for May Day

by IVOR MONTAGU

THE issues that are now being fought out are decisive issues for opening the avenue of realisation to our dream of May Day. And the vast bulk of the human race is being drawn into the action deciding them.

Isn't it clear ? Why ? First, victory will mean the downfall of fascism. And fascism is one of the last resorts and breastworks of tottering capitalism. Of course, one doesn't mean that on the defeat of Hitler all other fascists will chuck in the sponge. They will never give in till they are rooted out. They will become more subtle, more brutal. We shall have to deal with them at home as well as abroad. But equally, of course, the defeat of Hitler will enormously weaken and discredit fascism, and inspire its foes with strength and confidence.

Second, the actual process of the battle is strengthening and encouraging the forces of progress, isolating and discrediting those of reaction.

It is these two features which characterise the war, now, as a war of liberation and not an imperialist war. It is these features that Stalin foresaw when he predicted to the Soviet people (July 3, 1941): "Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties."

This prediction is already verified.

To consider the first point. The issue now involved in victory is plain enough. Every worker can see the difference to the world balance of imperialism involved in the triumphant survival, or the downfall, of the Soviet Union. Not a matter concerning just a nation, or group of nations, but the future of the whole world—all human progress.

An interesting reflection of the effect of the demonstrated might of the U.S.S.R., in contrast to the relative ineffectuality of the bourgeois democracies, is to be noted in the recent ferment within the circles of the Allied Governments. These, which began as puppets in the British imperial pocket, largely extremely reactionary in composition, are all in process of reconstruction—the Polish, the Czechoslovak by the dropping of Osusky, the Greek by the loss of the fascist ministers, etc.—in directions which minimise the anti-Soviet bias which characterised the foundation and pre-war history of their States. The development among their peoples is such that it affects them, despite their remoteness and expatriation.

One thing is certain. The fascists are in no doubt of the issue involved. Short-sighted people were surprised that the Japanese struck *after* Hitler had definitely received his check on the Eastern Front. But, of course, this was not surprising. Why should the Japanese or Franco, for example, assert themselves if Hitler is winning ? Then freedom will crumble everywhere, and rich prizes await them merely for the trouble of picking up. But, on the contrary, if he is losing. . . . Their doom will be sealed with his. Not to help him strive to avert it would be for themselves to go down without fighting in the backwash of humanity's triumph. It would be absurd for them to remain thus passive. Accordingly, it is certain that the French fascists, the Spanish fascists—more still, the British fascists and the American fascists—will play their cards the more desperately as Hitler's difficulties increase.

The second point—the strengthening of the forces of progress—is being demonstrated in very many different aspects.

Contrast May Day, 1942, with the first May Day. Then the forces working for the new world were almost a sect within the working class itself, their activity confined to preaching. Now whole nations are in action with them, casting their whole strength toward a common purpose that in fact is the first stage on their journey.

The type, of course, of the advanced section ceasing to be isolated, rallying the whole nation for liberation, and its enemies becoming exposed as the enemies of the nation, is to be seen in the result of the Communists' patient inspiration of the national front in China. The same result is being arrived at in other countries in a less simple "classic" manner, but in one way or another it is coming to pass everywhere.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the time of the first May Day capitalism had still benefits to offer, including apparent stability; its chaos and worst horrors were still hidden in the womb of time. Reaction, in those days, was respectable.

To-day the "old days" are everywhere discredited among the masses, and the reactionaries—among the bourgeoisie, the most ruthless; among the hangers-on of the working-class movement, those most opposed to labour unity and most bitterly hostile to Communism—stand exposed in nation after nation as Quislings and de Mans, as Pétains and Belins, as those most ready to act as traitors to their country, and act as hyena to the invader in ravening their countrymen.

And this is true not only in the occupied territories, but so far away, for example, as the Americas, where in the South it is the reactionary constitution-busters in the various republics who reveal themselves as facilitating Axis penetration; and in U.S.A., where the big trusts stand exposed as furnishing patents to Germany and Japan that they denied to their own Government for defence preparation.

The advanced section of the working class, the Communist vanguard, by its deeds in French railway marshalling yards, in Czech munition factories, in Jugoslav hills and Polish marshes, even in Rhineland and Silesian coal-mines, is earning the admiration of its enlightened fellow-nationals. Against whom is the fiercest venom and repression directed by the fascist enemies of mankind? What class do they seek to bribe and propitiate, and against whom, on the contrary, knowing all search for armistice to be futile, do they pour out their vilest persecutions? From Bordeaux on the Bay of Biscay, and the Norwegian fjords, to Mindanao in the Philippines, whether the executioner be Gestapo or Japanese, the feared opponent to be slaughtered is "the Communists." By their unrelenting struggle the Communists, in the eyes of all their countrymen, stand out as those in the forefront of the struggle for the liberation that all desire.

In the forefront of all is the tremendous influence of the Soviet example. There are two quotations from Stalin that are very apt in this matter :—

> We must march forward in such a way that the whole world, looking at us, may say: "This is my vanguard, this is my shock brigade, this is my working-class state, this is my fatherland; they are promoting their cause, which is our cause, and they are doing this well; let us support them!" (1931).

And :—

> If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case (1939).

In the ten months of the present stage of the war, this has certainly become the case. The bonds of solidarity that have been forged with the Soviet Union have become indissoluble. The spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries, its faith in its own power and victory, increase daily under the impetus of this inspiration. Humanity grows taller by inches.

We can see clearly all these processes going on in our own land, among our own people.

Capitalism is being felt as a fetter—not analysed as such theoretically by pioneers, but *felt* every day as such in every factory. Eighty years ago, in the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels confidently predicted, on the basis of their analysis of its character, that capitalism would become a fetter on production. To-day there is not a live man or woman worker in war industry who has not realised it as a part of their experience. The chaos of private interest, as well as its disloyalty in reserving methods and secrets, in basing itself on present profits or profits in a conjectured post-war future, is held right up under their noses.

Privilege, which at the time of the first May Day, was in common eyes a sort of taken-for-granted act of providence, stands out to-day as greed and treason, revealing at once the decadence of those who wallow in it, and their callous dis regard of national interest, displayed i disproportionate inroad in the limite national stock.

The reactionary fills us with nationa shame. When the label in the factor incautiously bids us "Remember Hong kong" because of the suffering there o British women and British prisoners, w remember Lord Simon, who found ex

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuses years ago for Japan's initial moves in that area—and who still serves as "highest judicial authority," to blackguard the *Daily Worker* for the Cabinet and advise it on its Indian proposals. Of all men living, he is perhaps the single one most responsible, by his role at Geneva, for the misery caused by the Japanese mperialists to-day. When a tiger escapes and kills a child, do we hate the wild beast only, while loading with honour and renewed responsibility the man who let it out? Nor do we forget Lord Halifax, the feted guest of Nazi leaders, who foreswore the national honour over Abyssinia, and still stands in Washington, representing us to the American people, last year revealing to Hitler our strategic plan, this year insulting the Indian national movement at the most delicate moment of negotiation.

Class-consciousness, the realisation by our people of its innate capacity, deepens rapidly. It is not merely a matter of realisation in the armed forces of the hamstrings on the talent of the rank and file. The glorious proof provided by the Red Army, on top of the preceding examples in China and in Spain, of the capacity for efficiency and leadership of men drawn from the masses. It is also in the factory. Vast numbers of British men and women have learned—as they could never have done under peace-time capitalism, when increased production is not necessarily in the workers' interest—that their elected works committees know, on the whole, a damn sight more about the solution of production problems than do the appointed managements of the owners. This experience inevitably takes them strides beyond labour politics of a past era and confronts them with the issue of working-class power in the interest of the nation.

Enlightenment is proceeding at a tremendous rate. The appearance in Britain for the first time of a mass Communist Party, 50,000 strong, is only one corner of one facet of the reflection of it.

Parallel with this development is taking place an almost frenzied and largely hidden activity by the enemies of progress, the hidden friends of fascism, the supporters of appeasement, the enemies of the Soviet Union through the years, the candidates for the post of the British Laval. Powerful in various security organs they use their influence to purge the forces and the foremost service of progressive influences; they infiltrate men of unimpeccable appeasement record into every department; no post is too small to be overlooked by them. It is they who promote and rejoice at measures of censorship and against the Press, precedents indispensable that they count on later to be useful. It is they who find specious reasons for the appeasement of Vichy and for hidden subsidies for Franco. It is they who have vetoed political agreement with the Soviet Union on the basis made plain by Stalin to Eden, the territorial integrity of the U.S.S.R., and have pretty successfully prevented the Press from commenting upon it for nearly five months. They are as active in Washington as in London. Their ambition—the agreement proposed by Hess, for which they have been striving publicly or secretly ever since the Spanish rebellion—the salvation of fascism at the expense of the Soviet Union and the common people everywhere. *Their existence provides Hitler with his chiefest hope.* Their dream—to preserve British and U.S. troops and armaments intact till Hitler falls and then police Europe to their pattern. *The Second Front is unpopular with them.* Their complaint against Churchill—too much aid to Russia; they murmur in the House of Commons corridors: "If he goes on like this, the result of all *our* sacrifice will be to make the Red Army supreme in Europe." They agree to a certain amount of aid—it will make bargaining with Hitler easier. As the Washington columnist quoted a British Embassy dinner companion: "The Russians are good for cannon-fodder, nothing else."

These poisonous, reptile elements dare not—at present—face the light of day, reveal their purposes to the British people. What constitutes them so dreadful a peril? Precisely that factor which has allowed the flourishing of similar corruption in every country—anti-popular policies in governing circles, the underestimation of the all-importance and unconquerableness of peoples, the lack of understanding of the strength of the people typical of the Eton or Harrow trained politician, the lack of faith in the strength of the working class typical of the cynical and disillusioned old working-class movement hack.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every worker in Britain feels instinctively, as a result of the examples on the one hand of U.S.S.R., China, Spain, on the other of Malaya, Singapore, Burma, that there is only one problem for the British people and humanity on the Indian question: how to enlist 380 millions in the common struggle. He can see in China that want of arms was not crucial, lack of military tradition was not crucial, only one ingredient was decisive—the actuality and the perspective of national liberation. Given the will to national survival, an invader can enter, but if he cannot bend the people to his will, he cannot conquer, cannot exploit resources, his invasion itself becomes only a perilous extension of supply lines. He can see in Burma and Malaya that want of national struggle renders the fight of each alien "garrison," however armed and trained, the gradual suicide of a doomed battalion. He can understand the Indian scepticism about the "inevitability" of being defended by the British authorities, in view of Nehru's declaration that those same authorities tenderly used up all the available transport in evacuating their own wives and children from Malaya and Burma, before surrendering all else in these territories, including Indian refugees, to the Japanese. He notes the Congress determination to mobilise, as the Soviet Union has, every citizen in defence of the country. And yet to such a prospect Cripps prefers, as he says, "the eggs scrambled long ago." What chance had Cripps of securing an agreement that meant resistance on a popular basis, the moment he undertook negotiation with such men as Amery and the Viceroy on his back?

The failure to secure the alliance with India—central strategic point on British supply lines to China, and American to U.S.S.R.—is paralleled by the failure to organise production in Britain to the fullest degree. To the anti-popular mind it is as "inevitable" that production should be organised *for* and not *by* the British worker, as that Indian defence should be organised *for* and not *by* the Indian citizen. It is the same error that leads to the subsidies to Vichy and Franco, preferring the scarcely even polite acceptance earned by such bounty to the illimitable potentialities of aiding French and Spanish overthrow of the fascist puppets and Hitler agents who oppress them. The same that is casting away opportunity after opportunity of winning the war, as consequence of underestimation of Soviet power. (From the General Staff in 1941 that based British strategy on the assumption the Red Army might survive six weeks to the new War Minister who, at Cardiff—in face of Stalin's prediction of Hitler Germany's collapse in six months or a year, and Litvinov's undertaking that with synchronous British action the Red Army would reach Berlin or beyond—declared it our duty to give aid to the Red Army in order to enable it "to last until next year.") The same that estimates the opening of a Second Front merely in military terms of the chances of retaining territory, utterly without realisation of the electrifying effect upon continental (and German) resistance that would be achieved by demonstrating British readiness to risk and sacrifice, instead of confining strategy to excuses about not having enough arms and appeals to the unarmed peoples of the occupied countries to do the fighting for us through the "V" campaign. The same that so underestimates the power of a people's resistance that it defends India by retaining in jail 20,000 of the best fighters for India's freedom; defends Malaya by jailing, up to the last minute, Malayan Communists who ask for either means to share in the defence or the right themselves to organise it; refuses to allow Pollitt and Gallacher to broadcast encouragement to the Europeans resisting Hitler; and suppresses the *Daily Worker*.

There is not a single one of these policies, respecting India, the production front, France, Spain, collaboration with U.S.S.R., the Second Front, the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, that does not play straight into the hands of Hitler's purpose. It is irrelevant how far each given one may be motivated in whole or part by anti-popular stupidity rather than fascist betrayal. As the famous Soviet writer, Ilya Ehrenburg, said of France: "How often is not folly mistaken for treason or does not treason masquerade as folly." It is folly, damping down of initiative, arbitrary rule that constitutes the humus in which the fungus of treason spreads and flourishes. For what to-day gives rise to a feeling of frustration, a sense of limitation and restriction to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exertion of full national effort, can at a crisis be exploited as a field for treachery.

Frustration. The feeling of frustration. But, one minute, realise the nature of it. This, the characteristic feeling of our people at this May Day moment, is not by any means a sign wholly bad. The contrary. There is implicit in it the promise—the pledge, indeed—of victory. Ten or even six months ago the far too prevalent mood was apathy—which is nothing, either complacency or defeatism, in any case disaster. But a feeling of frustration is already a very great thing, the measure of the wakening of the British people, the encouragement for the campaign and work of every member of our Party. *A sense of frustration can come only when there is realisation of the possibilities that are being missed.* Frustration was not the mood of the first May Day, for the opportunities were not there. It was not the mood of six months ago, for though the possibilities were there it was not generally appreciated that they were being missed. To-day we are waking to consciousness, and that in itself is the guarantee that we shall survive and surmount all obstacles.

May Day, 1942. We are nearer the last lap than the blind think. Like distance runners approaching the end of the course, let us throw our last strength into the sprint.

Labour's Crisis and Opportunity

by J. R. CAMPBELL

THE Labour Party Conference will meet at a time when the war will have reached a height of intensity never before known, and when it will be absolutely essential that the whole weight of Britain, to the last worker and the last soldier, is thrown into the struggle. It will meet at a time when there is considerable political unrest amongst the British people. This unrest has several elements. There is some war weariness ; there is a tendency on the part of some sections, due to our comparative immunity in the last twelve months (an immunity purchased by almost one million Russian dead), to press for small sectional advantages, and to ignore the over-riding considerations of winning the war. But the overwhelmingly strongest trend is that demanding more vigorous action. The mass of the British people want to make a powerful contribution to victory over Fascism, and they feel that they are being senselessly impeded by the Government's defective organisation of the war effort. They are beginning to express their resentment at this in ever stronger terms, and to insist on the Government taking vigorous action against Nazi Germany this year. In some cases this unrest is beginning to express itself in a drift away from old political attachments.

The union membership which is the basis of the Labour Party is showing an increasing awareness of its responsibility. Through Trades Councils, Shop Stewards' Committees and Union District Committees the active militants have led the drive for a greater productive effort. They have been the most active workers in the British-Soviet Committees now active throughout the country. Whatever else may be said about the working class, it can hardly be accused of political apathy.

Yet Labour Party organisation is in a weak condition. Ward Labour Parties are not meeting, Divisional Labour Parties are reduced to a shadow, and the remaining active membership is profoundly disheartened. A strong group of M.P.s is discontented with the general policy of the Party. There is a tendency to bring forward policies which, if accepted and operated by the Party, would lead to the immediate break-up of the Coalition. What is the cause of this situation in the Labour Party ?

In our opinion the cause can be stated in a few words. The Labour Party has refused to put itself at the head of the British people in their struggle for a more vigorous conduct of the war ; it has refused to participate in the creation of a powerful National Front of the British people which would steadfastly support the Government in all steps which it takes to overcome every obstacle to the unloosing of the most gigantic war effort on the part of the British people. Instead of helping forward the great movement of the British people, the Labour Party leadership has sulked and obstructed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the attack on the Soviet Union a series of British-Soviet Unity Committees sprang up all over the country. All political trends were represented on them. If the Labour Party had instructed its members to wholeheartedly participate it would have enlivened its whole local organisation; it would have made contacts with large sections of the population whom it is essential to win for the Labour cause. The local Conservative organisations were participating in any case, and no objection could have been made that the Labour Party was violating the political truce. But what happened? The Labour Party officials in South Wales conducted a powerful campaign against those all-party committees. Local Labour councillors were threatened by expulsion if they did not withdraw from these committees. In other parts of the country misguided Right Wing elements of the Labour Party turned up at committees sponsored by the local councils or mayors and declared that they could not participate unless the Communists were expelled. This ludicrous attempt to apply the Labour Party constitution to broad committees of all citizens was regarded with utter and complete amazement by the great body of citizens, who owed allegiance to neither the Labour nor the Communist Parties. In Scotland a slightly different state of affairs prevailed. There Joint Committees of the Trades Councils, Labour Party and Co-operative Party were set up. As Communists are not excluded from the Trades Councils or Co-operative Party, they participated in such committees and were often the organising and driving force within them. But the Communist Party as a body was excluded, and all attempts to broaden those committees to include all other organisations which desired to co-operate are met by threats of resignation from the Labour representatives, whose organisation incidentally has frequently made the poorest contribution to the joint effort. What is the basis of this attitude? It cannot be a sectarian desire to keep "oneself unspotted from the world," for Labour is in a coalition Government. It appears to be regarded as reasonable that Labour leaders should associate with Tories in the Government, but that Labour people should associate with Tories, Liberals and a great mass of unattached middle-class people on a local basis is supposed to be a damnable crime worthy of expulsion. There are no doubt secondary causes for the malaise in the Labour Party, but the major cause is the refusal of that Party to play the leading role in the great popular movement for a closer alliance with the Soviet Union, and for a headlong all-out effort to win the war. The result of this attitude was clearly shown in the recent political crisis when important and on the whole progressive changes took place in the Government. There is not the slightest indication that the Labour Party as a national body had any decided opinion or made any significant contribution to the changes which took place.

This major defect manifests itself in the document, "The Old World and the New Society," which is to be presented to the Labour Party Conference. The document purports to be a statement for reformist Socialism, and is no doubt expected to inspire the rank and file of the Labour Party and convince it that the Party is still out for Socialism. But there is a link missing in the exposition—namely, what to do now. In its last page the document boldly declares "the character we give to the remaining period of this conflict determines the character of reconstruction, both domestic and international." True enough, but the document itself is based on the blatant evasion of that fact. It confines itself to a criticism of capitalism and capitalist government before the war, to some suggestions for reconstruction after the war, and to the laying down of some general reformist Socialist principles. As it stands it gives the air of rather ineffective window dressing.

For example, the pamphlet states quite truly:—

> It was fear for privilege which, in the epoch of "appeasement," led so many of the corresponding classes in Britain, France and the United States to sympathise with the habits and purposes of the Fascist and Nazi dictators.

Agreed, but is it not worth enquiring whether "the fear for privilege" has completely disappeared, or whether it remains in many quarters impeding the full use of Britain's strength now? Is not this "fear for privilege" still impeding the opening of that Second Front in Europe which is essential to an early victory? Is this not behind the fear of a too complete victory

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Soviet Union? This "appeasement" policy works in new ways. It does not oppose a certain amount of material aid for the Soviet Union, because it is essential to keep the Soviet Union in the war. But it finds every possible technical, strategical excuse for refusing to fight alongside the Soviet Union in Europe. Yet the Labour Party remains silent on this vital question of the Second Front. Does this not mean that while it denounces "appeasement" in the past it is refraining from struggling against the most dangerous manifestation of appeasement in the present, namely, the refusal to open the Second Front? How can one expect to grow as a political party if one evades the major issue in British politics at the present moment?

Take the allied question of production. It is notorious that official Labour has remained silent on this while the dissident Labour M.P.s are apt to confine themselves to criticising the Government and to advocating all-out nationalisation.

What does the Labour Party propose in its resolutions and reports? In a resolution it states :—

> The pressure of war has already necessitated far-reaching Government control of industry, the central planning of the nation's economic life, and the subordination of many private nterests to the common good; and urges that this process be carried further in order to achieve swift and total victory.

In the report on reconstruction we are told that it is necessary, if there is to be effective reconstruction, to maintain :—

> he main wartime controls in industry and griculture.

There is no criticism of the character of these controls. Yet this is vital, as the econstruction report itself shows when it ays, with regard to the post-war situaion :—

> It is certain that, at the end of this war, the conomic system will have to lean heavily upon he support of the State. The central question his raises is whether this support is to be perated by the few in the interests of the few, r by the organised community in the interests f the community (p. 28).

Surely this control question is raised ow by the character of the existing controls? In the Communist Party "Memoandum on Production" and in the issue f the *Economist* for March 28th, there is a list of the existing controllers and their business affiliations. In virtually every case the controller is linked up financially with the industry or trade that he is controlling in the public interests. The "few" are brazenly sitting in the key positions of the State control apparatus here and now. They are a present incubus to the fight against Fascism, and not merely a post-war danger. The dissident M.P.s do not help, however, by sweeping proposals for nationalisation. They know that this cannot be realised without a transfer of power to the workers. To put it forward now is to do general propaganda and nothing more.

If the Labour Party desires action and immediate results it should concentrate more on securing a really impartial State control. The controllers must be expert technical people, but they should not be linked up with that phase of trade that they are controlling. By all means take the advice of the business men in the various sectors, but let us have controllers who will be prepared to disregard it when necessary in the public interests. A real Ministry of Production, with a proper planning commission and real controls at the top and effective Regional Boards with stronger working-class representation on them—that is the immediate next step that the Labour Party should take on the production question. Not forgetting, of course, the ever-present need of helping to create a good production morale amongst the workers.

If it adopted this policy the Labour Party would find that it could win the support of many people who do not care two hoots about nationalisation, indeed who regard it as an insincere party cry, but who are equally convinced that strong measures should be taken against monopolists who are thinking of profits and not victory.

On the most vital question of India the reconstruction memorandum declares :—

> It (the Labour Party) believes that both at the centre and in the provinces Indians must be given full responsibility now, and that Indians must take their full place alongside Dominion Statesmen in the direction of the war effort.

We will assume, in accordance with the context, that the Indians who are to be given "full responsibility" now are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

genuine representatives of the Indian people. At the moment of writing (Easter week-end) it is precisely the refusal to give Indian representatives either full or a substantial measure of responsibility for defence that is preventing the acceptance of the Cripps plan. The Labour Party will win the confidence of the British people if it comes out for the fullest measure of justice now.

If Labour is to effectively carry out this policy it must be prepared to adopt a new attitude to the unity of the British people. No one is asking it to give up its principles. But it could with great profit, not only to the national effort but to itself, wholeheartedly participate in the great movement for Anglo-Soviet unity, and for a more vigorous war effort. Only ageing and frightened bureaucrats will see dangers in this, as if coming out of a prison house of one's own construction was a danger and not an escape to greater responsibility and power.

Above all, the conference must be prepared to face up to the relations of the Labour Party to the Communist Party. The Labour chiefs can be under no illusions as to the growing power of the Communist Party. Are they big enough, however, to see it as a friendly power which would contribute much to reinvigorating the Labour Party? The bogy of Communism has been laid to a considerable extent in recent months. Millions of people have now a clearer understanding of the role of Communism in the world to-day. We would not urge the Labour Party to miraculously reverse its previous attitude, but it would show an open mind if it at least was prepared to explore the question with the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has now a larger and more active membership than the I.L.P. had at the time when it was the main factor in winning new adherents for the Labour Party. Why throw away this splendid reinforcement at the behest of an ancient prejudice? This, and not the succumbing to suicidal anti-coalition moods, is the way forward for the Labour Party. The abandonment of the Coalition at this stage would be treated by millions of people as a desertion of the struggle. But participation in the Coalition need not doom the Labour Party to passivity. It can play a powerful role in the creation of a great National Front; it can head the drive for the most efficient organisation of production, and for justice to India. It can come before the British people as the dynamic partner in the Coalition, and can, on the basis of increased influence, do much more to curb the arrogance and greed of monopoly capitalism. The Labour Party should not waste a fraction of a second disputing with Mr. Churchill as to whether the Tory Party shall be the predominant party in post-war Britain or not. This will be determined not by the speeches of Mr. Churchill, but by the part played by the parties in the struggle for victory. Let the Labour Party play a really leading role, and it can make the prophecy of Mr. Churchill look foolish. This and not abstract propaganda is also the way forward to Socialism.

It is a tragedy, however, that Labour Ministers are allowing themselves to become the instruments of reactionary policies which can only discredit the Labour Party. Of what use is it for the Labour Party to talk of "freedom of speech and expression" while Mr. Morrison maintains his ban on the *Daily Worker*? To impose a ban for one reason and maintain it for another cannot bring prestige to the Labour Party.

It would be futile, however, to blame the leaders for the present state of the Labour Party. Those trade unionists who are still Labour men in their basic outlook, and yet who take no steps to ensure that their union is affiliated to the local Labour Party and is represented by live delegates, must bear their share of the responsibility. There is a yawning gap between the activity of trade unionists in the workshops and their inactivity in the Labour Party. This policy of abstention must be dropped. Big changes in the attitude of the Labour Party can be brought about if large numbers of fresh trade unionists begin to appear at the meetings of local Labour Parties. This must go on even if the Labour chiefs remain wedded to their old ways. But if the Labour leadership is capable of a realistic stocktaking it can do much to help. It can remove some of the bureaucratic fetters on local initiative; it can encourage its members to be active in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

broad movements; it can adopt a new attitude to the question of Communist affiliation; it can come out more unequivocally for a strengthening of the alliance with the Soviet Union, and for an all-round improvement in the organisation and effort of the British Government. If it does so it will not lack a speedy response, for this and not any paper programmes (contradicted by daily practice), nor any anti-coalition contortions, is Labour's path to the leadership of the British people, to a predominant voice in the post-war world—to power.

The Problem of Labour Unity

by P. G. BARSTOW, M.P.

We print below a further contribution on the points of view raised by Alderman Luke Hogan's article published in our March number

ALDERMAN HOGAN raises very important questions in his article in the March issue, and in considering them it is well to face the difficulties which stand in the way of unity.

During the years preceding the war Labour Party conferences spent a considerable amount of time discussing resolutions calling for the affiliation of the Communist Party, and although the vote fluctuated the result was always the same —defeated by a large majority. It is frequently argued that the block vote of the big unions decided the issue, but that is only partly true, as the card votes demonstrated that a large number of parties consistently voted against the proposal. But the position does not end there, inasmuch as the controlling body of the Labour Party, *i.e.*, the trade unions, also debars any member of the Communist Party from membership of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

In principle the Labour Party and the Communist Party are socialist bodies having the same ultimate object. Why, therefore, the undisguised hostility of both parties to each other? Over the years the attack has been constant, particularly from the Communist Party; and the method of attack, in particular that of opposing Labour candidates at elections, has strengthened the opposition of the Labour Party. In fact, the view is still held that the desire for affiliation is not genuine, and that if the Communist Party were allowed to affiliate they would make their objective the disruption of the Labour Party. I do not subscribe to that view, but I know that a large number do.

It is often alleged that the Communist Party can only act on orders from the Soviet Union, and that they are more loyal to that country than they are to their own. It is also alleged that the Communist Party diagnosis of world events is generally wrong, *e.g.*, their attitude, in this country and in France, to the present world war. But are we in the Labour Party quite sure that our own diagnosis of events previous to and during the war has been correct? Did we not fail to read the signs during the Spanish civil war, and did we not support the Tory Government in its refusal to supply arms to the legitimate Spanish Government, even though we knew that that war was the forerunner of the present war? Did we as a Party take a definite line at the time of Munich, even though the Soviet Government was prepared to honour its obligations to Czechoslovakia? Did we force a show-down on the Government's negotiations with the Soviet Union during 1939? Did we not reject any idea of a Popular Front to embrace all the progressive forces in the country in order to prevent the present war? Of course we did, because we were not prepared to have any connection with the Communist Party.

Let us again cast our minds back to the events of 1939, which culminated in the Pact between the Soviet Union and the Nazis. What a howl of execration against the Soviet Union followed, and yet, remembering the flippant and insincere manner in which the British Government conducted its negotiations with the Soviet Union, and looking at the matter afresh in the light of more recent events, can we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that our political judgment was sound?

Again, take the question of Finland. When she refused the proposals made to her by the Soviet Government, which ultimately caused the latter to apply force in order to safeguard her frontiers in the war she knew was coming, did not members of my own party want to declare war on the Soviet Union? Of course they did—because they failed to interpret the facts.

It can be claimed, therefore, that mistakes have been made not only by the Communist Party but by ourselves. But whatever mistakes have been made, the attack on the Soviet Union in June, 1941, made us all, Labour Party and Communist Party, realise that the time had come to close our ranks, and the Trades Union Congress, deplorable though its attitude has been in the past, at once rose to the occasion. Whereas months of negotiation had resulted in the refusal of the International Federation of Trade Unions to accept the federation of the Soviet unions—largely as the result of the opposition of our Trades Union Congress—war at once brought unity between the two peoples, and the Trades Union Congress lost no time in getting to work. Similarly the visit of the Soviet trade union delegation to this country infused new vigour into our own workers and at once increased output, particularly of tanks. Wonderful meetings and cheering crowds testified to the affinity between our people and their Soviet colleagues.

It has taken a war to tear down the veil of lies about the Soviet Union, but the war has also destroyed other illusions. The financial and industrial classes are wondering what kind of a world will be left when the war is over, and what they can save from the wreckage. The workers are determined that there shall be no return to 1939. Before that time arrives, our job is to take every possible step to hasten a speedy victory. When that is done, the people themselves will enforce unity, no matter what vested interests try to oppose it. The change from pre-war to post-war conditions will be immense. The problems to be faced will be totally different, but if we allow division to continue in our ranks, we shall never have the opportunity to solve them. The Communist Party should be with us as part of one great party assisting us, together with our Soviet comrades, to establish the new social order of "Socialism" throughout the world.

India Threatened

by BEN BRADLEY

THE full tragedy of the failure of the recent negotiations between the War Cabinet and the Indian people must be clearly appreciated by those who desire (*a*) total war in order that Hitler and his allies will be smashed this year, and (*b*) that the principles for which we are fighting—the freedom of all peoples—should apply immediately to all people opposed to fascism, thus making it possible for them to participate in this great struggle.

Sir Stafford Cripps has returned to this country empty handed. The reason for this is the fact that the proposals taken by him on behalf of the War Cabinet did not indicate an appreciation of the urgency of the situation; neither did they show any generous approach to the aspirations of the Indian people.

The Press of this country have been at considerable pains to present the proposals as most generous, and to distort the actual position in India, thus to create the impression that should negotiations fail, as they have done, the responsibility would not be due to the British Government.

The *Calcutta Statesman*, one of the leading British newspapers in India, wrote, "We regret greatly the announcement of Sir Stafford Cripps's immediate departure," in an article contending that the blame for the present position lies with the India Office and the official section of the Government of India.

This may well be so, but Sir Stafford Cripps came very near to wrecking any possibility of discussion with the recognised leaders of Indian opinion at the very

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outset by his ultimatum that the proposals were unalterable, and that if they were not accepted no further offer would be made during the war. Fortunately, due to the realistic and tolerant approach of the Congress leaders, he had to retreat from this position, and discussions took place.

Let us briefly examine these proposals which were taken to India.

The proposals actually fall into two parts: (1) policy in respect of India's demand for self-government; and (2) policy in respect of the immediate situation facing India and the world as a result of the menace of fascism.

What are these proposals which are considered to be so generous? In the first part the British Government ignores the fact that 200 years of British rule is to-day responsible for the present plight of the Indian people. Mass impoverishment and illiteracy, and almost complete lack of industrial development, and also that which shows up very sharply in the present situation, the denial of the right of the Indian people to organise the defence of their own country.

In spite of this, the British Government desire to assume the role of arbiter in respect of a future Constitution for India. The Government proposals laid down that the object was :—

> The creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion, associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by common allegiance to the Crown, but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs.

The time for implementing the above object is put as "immediately on the cessation of hostilities," when steps will be taken to set up in India an elected body charged with the task of framing a Constitution.

The body to be charged with this important task, according to the proposals, will be constituted by the members of the Provincial Assemblies constituting themselves into an Electoral College and electing 10 per cent. of its number, plus representatives of Indian States.

It should be noted that the election to the Provincial Assemblies will be on the basis of the 1935 Constitution, under which approximately only 27 per cent. of the adult population have a vote. Further, on the basis of this, there will be about 1,585 members of the Electoral College, out of which less than one-half are directly elected from what are termed general constituencies, while the rest are made up from special Moslem constituencies, Chambers of Commerce and special interests.

Then on top of this the Indian Princes, who exercise despotic rule of the Indian States, will have representation on the Electoral College on the basis of the *total population* in each State, and with the same powers as British India members.

Thus the Electoral College starts off with the very serious handicap of more than half its members being representative of reactionary and vested interests and princes. The vast majority of the Indian population would thus be unrepresented in this proposed Constitution-making body.

The proposals then state that the British Government undertakes to accept and implement forthwith the Constitution so framed by this Constitution-making body, subject only to :—

> (1) The right of any Province of British India that is not prepared to accept the Constitution to retain its present Constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides.

Such non-acceding Provinces shall, according to the Government, be allowed to frame their own Constitution, and will be accorded the same status as the proposed Indian Union. Indian States may or may not elect to adhere to the proposed Indian Union Constitution.

The proposals, therefore, prepared for an extremely unrepresentative Constitution-making body of very doubtful character and placed a premium upon disunity. Rather than working for a United India, the proposals appear to me to have stood for the creation of separate sovereign States, or States subject to the British Government.

Sir Stafford Cripps, in replying to questions, stated that non-acceding Provinces, and even Provinces within the Union, could have separate armies, and that units recognised by H.M. Government can have their own and separate relations with foreign Governments.

I have taken space to analyse some of the more important features of what may be termed the first part of the proposals, or the policy in respect of India's demand for self-government, in order to show the

PRODUCED 2005 BY ONZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reactionary character of the Government proposals, and to challenge the general propaganda that they are in any way generous.

The above proposals did not come in for the main discussion in India for the simple reason that the Indian National Congress has directed its attention to the immediate situation and the threat of Japanese invasion.

The second part of the proposals dealing with the present situation made it clear that "until the new Constitution is framed H.M. Government must inevitably bear responsibility for, and retain control and direction of, the defence of India as part of their world war effort, but the task of organising to the full the military, moral and material resources of India must be the responsibility of the Government of India with the co-operation of the people of India."

This leaves the defence of India completely in the hands of the representatives of the British Government, while the Indian leaders will have the task of organising the supply of men and material.

It was around this part of the proposals that most discussion took place. The Indian National Congress asked for the right of the Indian people to be responsible for the defence of *their* country, and for a Government in India that could claim the confidence of the people.

Sir Stafford Cripps held discussions in New Delhi with representatives of various bodies—the Indian National Congress, the Moslem League, the Liberal Federation, the Hindu Mahasabha, and so on.

In these discussions a sharp contrast is shown between the approach of the Indian National Congress and the Moslem League. While Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, on behalf of the Congress, have been concerned with the present emergency and defence of India, Mr. Jinnah has been primarily concerned with certain Moslem interests and the establishment of Pakistan.

Let me emphasise that the Indian National Congress represents the overwhelming majority of the Indian people—Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, etc. In 1937, when the Provincial Assembly elections took place under the present Constitution, the Congress secured a two to one majority, and Congress Governments were formed in 9 out of 11 Provinces.

Any settlement on behalf of the Indian people must in the long run rest with the Congress because it commands the allegiance of the great majority of the Indian people.

Almost the whole Press, and even the B.B.C., has been concerned to minimise the status of the Indian National Congress and to describe it as a Hindu body.

This is part of the policy to show the position in India as being Hindu versus Moslem, and that the British Raj is there, holding the scales evenly balanced.

What is the Moslem League that it should be treated on an equal basis as the Indian National Congress ? The Moslem League was founded in December, 1906, and in 1910 Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald wrote a book, "The Awakening of India," in which he said of the League that :—

> The political successes which have rewarded the efforts of the League have been so signal as to give support to the suspicion that sinister influences have been at work, that the Mohammedan leaders were inspired by certain Anglo-Indian officials, and that these officials pulled wires at Simla and in London, and of malice aforethought sowed discord between the Hindus and Mohammedan communities by showing the Mohammedans special favours.

In the same year as the Moslem League was formed it sent a deputation to the Viceroy, Lord Minto. Lord Minto received the deputation and announced his acceptance of all their demands.

It was subsequently revealed by the great Moslem leader, Mohamed Ali, in the course of his Presidential Address to the 1923 Session of the Indian National Congress, that this Moslem deputation was "a command performance" arranged by the Government.

Yet it was Mr. Jinnah of the Moslem League that occupied so much time of Sir Stafford Cripps putting forward his plans of Pakistan—the demand that all territory north of the Indus Valley should be an independent Moslem country.

The overwhelming majority of Moslems do not desire this separation. Abdul Ghaffer Khan, the Congress leader, speaks for the Moslem Pathan of the North-west Frontier where there was a Congress Government ; they do not want it.

The present Governments of the two Provinces of Bengal and Sind, both with large Moslem populations, have expressed opinions against Pakistan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY NZDRC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is necessary to get this clear, and to remove the picture created by the tremendous Press barrage that the main problem was a communal one. It is not so. My own experience among the workers and peasants of India in the Trade Union and Peasant Movements, and in strike action there, is complete unity between Hindu and Moslem.

The Indian National Congress is quite conscious of the special interests of the various communities—Hindu, Moslem, Sikh, Parsee and so on—that go to make up the vast Indian population, and will take steps to see that those interests are protected.

These are not, however, the main questions facing the people of India at this critical moment. The two Congress leaders, Jawaharlal Nehru and Abdul Kalam Azad (Hindu and Moslem, though the Kemsley Press may not know), directed their discussion along the lines that the present urgent situation demands: that is, the part the Indian people will play in the united struggle against fascism and in defence of their country, and the establishment of a responsible Provisional National Government that commands the confidence of the people.

In the discussions certain concessions were made allowing for an Indian Defence Member, who would be responsible for organising the moral and material resources of India for the war.

But when this came to be defined with more precision, all the important power for recruiting and political control over the Army was reserved to the Commander-in-Chief, who would not be responsible to an Indian Executive Council, but only to the War Cabinet in Britain.

At the present moment the Viceroy is not only the Governor-General; he chooses all members of the Executive Council and presides over every meeting of the Council. He takes decisions sometimes on behalf of the entire government of India without consulting a single member, and can reject the advice of even the majority if he thinks it necessary. Moreover, there are several departments in his personal charge, for decisions about which he need not, and frequently does not, consult the Executive Council.

It was on this question of responsibility that the visit of Cripps failed. The Congress Resolution stated :—

> That to take away defence from the sphere of (Indian) responsibility at this stage is to reduce that responsibility to a farce and to nullity, and to make it perfectly clear that India is not going to function as a free and independent Government during the war.
>
> The essential and fundamental pre-requisite for the assumption of responsibility by the Indian people in the present is the realisation as a fact that they are free and are in charge of maintaining and defending their freedom.

The keen desire to unite with the forces of freedom in the present great world struggle against fascism is expressed by the whole working class, peasant and student movement in India. These vast sections have watched closely the discussions, sincerely trusting that the outcome would give India the rightful standing to play her part in this great struggle.

This keen desire of the Indian masses was expressed at the last session of the All-India Congress Committee held in January, when Mahmud Ali Khan (Punjab) moved certain amendments to the Resolution on behalf of the Communist Party. They stated, *inter alia*, that the Congress recognised the changed character of the war, and realised that the supreme issue before all mankind to-day was the achievement of a final and complete victory over Hitler and his allies. The present reactionary policy of the British Government should not prevent the Indian people from forging their rightful place in the war against fascism. The All-India Congress Committee was asked to declare its full and whole-hearted support to the cause of the peoples of Russia, China, Great Britain and America and of the Nazi-occupied countries in Europe.

This is a clear lead to the people of India. In order to carry this effectively into operation, the many trade union, peasant and Communist leaders must be released from the prisons in India.

The lessons of Malaya, Singapore and Burma are such that could not be ignored. The people of these countries did not want the Japanese invaders, but the British Government failed to win the people in a free alliance in the common struggle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Free India, in unity with the Chinese people, can be the rock upon which the plans of the Axis Powers in the East can be smashed. The grave and urgent situation demands a settlement satisfactory and acceptable to the Indian people.

Even in this hour of great disappointment Jawaharlal Nehru issues a stirring call to his countrymen—"Who lives if India perishes? India calls, and every Indian, man and woman, must listen to that call. Let each one of us stick to the post of duty whatever befalls."

India receives the shock of air raids from another foreign power; the East Coast harbour towns of Vizagapatam and Cocoanada are raided by the Japanese and the first casualties reported. At the same time, the eastern arm of the Axis Powers steadily advances along the Irrawaddy through Burma to the frontier of India.

Hitler in the West prepares for his spring offensive, while Japan drives through from the East. Frustrated by the heroic defence of the Soviet Union, in desperation these two fascist Powers prepare their gigantic pincer movement aimed at linking up in the Middle East.

The peoples of the democratic countries are facing the eve of the greatest battles the world has known. It is in this situation of gravest danger that the world democratic front of all free peoples must be strengthened by the fighting alliance of all peoples opposed to fascism. The Indian people are opposed to fascism, and our urgent task is to remove any obstacle that may be in the way, thus enabling India to take her place in the world democractic front against fascism.

In order to secure this we must demand the immediate reopening of discussions with the Indian National Congress on the basis that a Provisional National Government will be established immediately, through which the responsibility of mobilising and organising the people for the defence of India will be in the hands of the leaders and representatives of the Indian people.

Fifty Thousand Communists

by D. F. SPRINGHALL

THE first phase of a tremendous political campaign which ranks as the most powerful and significant since the days of Chartism was recently concluded by the Communist Party.

Carried through during the first quarter of the year—a period which represented a most critical point in the war—the campaign achieved most far-reaching political results, judged both by the character of their inevitable future consequences as well as in their immediate effect.

Organised around the theme of "Unity for Victory in 1942," a great programme of demonstrations and meetings throughout the country attracted everywhere record audiences. Party spokesmen carried the policy and slogans of the Party amongst hundreds of thousands of workers in mass meetings in factory canteens and at many hundreds of other meetings called for factory workers. The Party's policy in support of all measures necessary for winning the war in 1942 was carried into hundreds of towns and villages which previously had never heard a Communist spokesman. The topical literature of the Party, as well as the classic works of Marxism, was sold and distributed in new record quantities.

Party speakers were invited to address trade union, labour and co-operative meetings, and were warmly received in working men's clubs and amongst chapel and other religious communities.

Never before have so many of these bodies voted contributions towards the Party's campaign funds as in connection with the £40,000 fund which was raised by the end of the campaign period.

This widespread and intensive activity played a major part in arousing the great public feeling which led to the Government changes, the new approach to India, the recognition by the Government of Joint Production Committees, and the remarkable growth of feeling and support for opening a Second Front. The Party's work during this period has served to stimulate enormously the will to face all hardships and sacrifices involved in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

making a superhuman contribution to the attainment of an allied victory over fascism. This was most markedly shown in the closing stages of the campaign in the concluding series of enormously enthusiastic Party rallies and outstanding in the great success of London's united "Victory in 1942" rally in Trafalgar Square, which attracted speakers from all the political Parties and an audience larger than any seen in this historic assembly place since the famous "Bloody Sunday" demonstration in 1892.

The session of the Party's Central Committee, held during November, 1941, which decided to launch the campaign to commence on January 1, aimed to increase the Party's membership by 15,000 new members. Actually, on the termination of the three months' effort, no fewer than 25,194 new members had been enrolled. This represented an increase of 111 per cent. on the total membership at January 1.

A significant feature of the recruitment is that the overwhelming majority of the new members were drawn from workers in the principal industries throughout the country.

Pride of place in this notable achievement goes to the Party organisations in London, for long the Party's leading district.

Here the membership increase was from 9,000 members at January 1 to 16,500 at March 31.

Well over 10,000 of London's membership is organised in groups in over 500 industrial enterprises, embracing more than a million workers.

Scotland has second place with an increase during the same period of 3,173 members, bringing the total at March 31 to 6,316, of whom nearly 50 per cent. are organised in Party units in factories, shipyards, transport services, etc. Similarly striking results were achieved in both Lancashire and the Midland districts.

The District Committees of the Party in these two important areas conducted their entire activities along the lines of a spirited Socialist competition. Lancashire just succeeded in retaining its position as third largest Party District by bringing its membership to a figure of 4,830 as against Midlands 4,686. This represents an increase of 202 per cent. for Lancashire; whilst Midlands, who started off with several hundred less, registered a percentage growth of 290!

South Wales also won a noteworthy success in doubling its January membership of 1,094 and quadrupling its number of Party organisations in pits and factories. Space prevents mention of the individual progress of the 14 other Party Districts, all of which, however, made substantial membership gains, 10 of them by upwards of 100 per cent.

These figures indicate how the Party, whose enemies have often made sneering references to its "insignificance," has been transformed into a powerful new force in British political life. This in itself is striking evidence of the extraordinary growth of interest in Communism which has taken deep roots amongst the people, a process which has been steadily thrusting its way forward since the advance of the Bolsheviks to power in Russia in 1917 gave to the world an object lesson in the superiority of the Socialist regime, and now accelerated in consequence of the amazing military feats of the Red Army and the heroic achievements of the entire Soviet people, which have provided further object lessons as to how total war against the fascist barbarians should be fought.

This new advance of the Communist Party signifies a profound strengthening of the whole British working-class movement.

"The strengthening of the Communist Parties," said Comrade Dimitrov, in his memorable report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935, "is not a narrow Party concern, but the concern of the entire working class."

The outcome of the campaign conducted by the Communist Party means that for the first time in its history the British working class has as its instrument a powerful Marxist Party firmly entrenched amongst the workers in factories, pits, shipyards and transport services, etc. Hundreds of examples could be brought forward as evidence that it is precisely the industrial enterprises where the Communist Party groups are functioning that show the highest degree of labour discipline, showing itself in decreasing absenteeism and voluntarily increased intensity of labour, the strongest and most effective trade union and shop

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stewards movement, just as in the localities where the Communist Party is a virile public force, there is similar evidence of the desire to do everything to further strengthen the Anglo-Soviet alliance, and growing movements for joint activity of all working-class and other local forces in the interests of strengthening the local war effort in every way possible.

It must be stated, however, that despite the changes in Government personnel that have been brought about, the existing situation is fraught with grave peril for the British people.

The Government changes have not brought in their train as yet those fundamental changes in policy and military strategy which are an absolute essential to the attainment of victory.

The Red Army still fights on alone, unsupported by any easement in their situation that could alone be brought about by the opening of a Second Front.

This is the most urgent dire need in the present situation; on this depends the very existence and fate of humanity.

Only by sustained offensive action, in unity with the Red Army, can the power of Hitler be destroyed.

The Communist Party will work and fight on with ever greater vigour and strength to bring into full play all the mighty strength of organised public opinion that will compel the adoption of this course.

This conditions the further phase of the activities of the Communist Party—which will take the form of a Spring Campaign, during which the Party will bring to bear all its new strength and resources, and which will result in new efforts which will far surpass in range and effectiveness all that was achieved during the first three months of this year.

The Party will devote all its power towards extending the united action of the working-class forces, for it is upon the unity of the Labour Movement that, beyond any other factor, will make for the most effective mobilisation of the whole British people, backing up a strengthened Government under the leadership of Churchill that will command the full confidence of the people by the character of its Victory policy; the Party will redouble its efforts to compel the restoration of the *Daily Worker* as an indispensable weapon in the struggle for victory over fascism; the Party during the coming months will rally fresh thousands behind its standards.

Victory and the German People

by W. GALLACHER, M.P.

CAN the war be won this year? This question is now agitating the minds of people everywhere. In the Press and on the platform, in the streets and in the factories, 1942 is talked of as the vital decisive year. Garvin, in the *Sunday Express* (April 5), says:—

> This is the year of years. I have dared to call it nothing less than the pinch of eternity for free civilisation, with all its hopes and dreams for the future of man and the soul of the world.

This comes as the conclusion of a long article which entirely fails to mention the one all-dominant factor that can decide, this year, the fate of the world—the full implementation of the alliance with the Soviet Union. This alliance demands complete military *and political* co-operation in the war against Nazi Germany. Defeat Nazi Germany, says Churchill, and Japan's position will become impossible in face of the forces arrayed against her.

But to defeat Nazi Germany, there is need not only for the immediate launching of a Western Front, for which expert opinion, backed up by the mass of the people, is everywhere calling; but it is also absolutely necessary to win away the masses of German people from the Nazis and make them the means of freeing Germany from the brutal domination of the monopoly capitalists who fed and nurtured the Fascist beasts. Never forget it was the German people who drove the Kaiser out of Germany, and who would have driven out the capitalists and Prussian Junkers had they not been held back, tricked and deceived by their Social Democratic leaders.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tricked and deceived at the end of the war; tricked and deceived all the years that followed it, right up to the time when they were advised to vote Hindenburg as against Thaelmann, on the lying plea that Hindenburg would save them from Hitler.

During these years of deception their sufferings under the terrible Versailles Treaty were indescribable. This has to be remembered. Only as we understand these years of suffering can we understand the character of propaganda that should be made to the German people. For the German people are as other people. They want to live in peace; they want to see their children grow up to happy manhood and womanhood, not to be crushed by Nazi tyranny and made the helpless victims of Nazi war lust.

Right up to the last they refused to vote for Hitler and the Nazis. They were betrayed to Hitler by Hindenburg, who was presented to them as their saviour by the leaders of Social Democracy.

But once Hitler and his Nazi gang got power, backed by the big monopolies, the most brutal tyranny ever known since the world began was imposed on the German people. Trade unions, Co-operatives, political parties destroyed; all expression of opinions ruthlessly suppressed; the headsman's axe for those who dared to carry on political propaganda. Under such conditions, it is not surprising that we do not hear the voice of the people, but it would be utterly wrong to presume that the people are silent. In whispered words, in cunningly contrived forms, at the risk of torture and death, the message of hope is carried from one to another, from factory to factory, from district to district. Foremost in this whispered campaign will be the words of Stalin, words that give the key to the kind of propaganda that should go pouring into Germany.

"It would be ridiculous," said Stalin in his striking Order of the Day on February 23, "to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German State. The experience of history shows that Hitlers come and go, whereas the German people and the German State remain."

These pregnant words will be whispered all over Germany; they will not be blared out nightly from the Nazi propaganda radio. That honour (?) is reserved for Lord Vansittart and those Labour leaders who have joined his evil chorus. They get the fullest publicity from Goebbels. There is to be no freedom for the German people if the Nazis lose the war. Instead, a new and worse Versailles; starvation, subjection and slavery. Night after night the Vansittart propa anda goes streaming out into German homes, into the factories, into the clubs and beer-gardens. If Hitler fails, you are lost. That is what Vansittart is howling at them. That is the depth of degradation to which the former adherents of the Labour and Socialist International, who now associate themselves with Vansittart propaganda, have degenerated. They have repudiated and betrayed every principle of working class internationalism.

Risking their lives with every word they speak, with every move they make, Socialists and Communists in Germany seek to persuade the German workers and the German people that their one hope for peace and security is the overthrow of Hitler and his Nazi murder gangs.

Stalin's words in the "Order of the Day" are as a mighty weapon to them; Vansittart and his Labour henchmen are a deadly menace to them. What is behind all this talk of "keeping down the German people" when the war is won? It is fear of the people. "Keeping down the German people" has led straight from the last war to the present war. They were kept down under Versailles, then kept down under Hitler; in order to keep Hitler firmly in power, country after country was betrayed to him—by our own Municheers. All those who are now yelling loudest about the German people were foremost in support of Munich and the gross and unspeakable betrayal of the people of Czechoslovakia. Vansittart and his kind are not dreading a new war after this one; their one great dread is a new revolutionary Germany. "Keep the people down." That is the attitude that lost Malaya, that lost Singapore, that may even yet lose India, and that can lose this country. For here also, in the vital sphere of production, it is the select few at the top who count, and the great masses of workers, from whom energy, initiative and production alone can come, are to be kept subject to their superior industrial overlords. "Fear of the people"—that is what is behind all this evil and dangerous Vansittart propaganda. And it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is because the Government is led by those who also fear and distrust the people that it is allowed to go on, as though it were the official propaganda of this country. Nothing of a contrary or condemnatory character comes from the Government. On March 4 Commander King Hall, who specialises in propaganda, put a question to Eden to find out what the Government's attitude was to Stalin's presentation of the question. Eden's answer was a model of evasion. Here it is: "The attitude of His Majesty's Government in this matter is not inconsistent with the pronouncement recently made by Mr. Stalin." Evasion does not help the Anglo-Soviet alliance; it hinders it; and whatever hinders the Anglo-Soviet alliance plays into the hands of Hitler and the Nazis.

In every occupied country it is to the people that we look for a rising against Hitler. Time and again we hear of how they eagerly await the landing of British troops so that the hidden arms may be brought out into service. But in these countries also the Vansittart propaganda is being used. The people of France, of Belgium, of Holland, of Norway, of Poland and Czechoslovakia, they know that the Vansittarts not only want to "keep down" the people of Germany, but that they want to "keep down" the people everywhere. Thus the evil effect of this propaganda is felt not only in Germany, but it has its blighting effect all over the Continent. It is time, more than time, that we had a clear, straight declaration from the Government of this country. The strongest possible condemnation of Vansittart and his Labour choir-boys, a statement of complete political agreement with the Soviet Union on this important issue, would give our propaganda to Germany and the Continent an entirely new character. It would break a weapon at present in the hands of Goebbels, and put a new and powerful weapon in the hands of those heroic men and women who, despite the frightful penalties that await discovery, still carry on the task of arousing and organising the German people for the overthrow of Hitler fascism.

Since writing the above I have seen the report of a speech made by the chairman of the I.L.P. at an Easter Conference of that Party, or rump of a Party. According to the chairman they want Socialism and nothing but Socialism, and until they get Socialism they won't do anything.

Anyone can *talk* about Socialism. MacDonald when he was Prime Minister of two Labour Governments was always advising the I.L.P. to *talk* about Socialism and not to get involved in the sordid squabbles about another 1s. or so on unemployed benefit.

When Ellen Wilkinson went to interview Prime Minister MacDonald about the poverty and unemployment in Jarrow his first words were:—

"Ellen, why don't you go out and preach Socialism?"

Hitler and Goebbels were experts at *talking* about Socialism. It was one of the means they used for confusing and disrupting the working class.

Marx and Engels tell us in the introduction to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto (1882) that they could not name their famous document the Socialist Manifesto because of the variety of quacks who were degrading the name of Socialism. Engels repeats this in the German edition (1890).

Lenin also has given us valuable advice on this matter. He too came up against Mensheviks, talkers of Socialism. Their words, he said, sound all right, but—compare their words with their actions, then it will be seen that they are petty bourgeois liberals, with no interest whatever in the real fight for Socialism, the prosecution of the class war.

So let us consider the leaders of the I.L.P. rump. Are they using the parliamentary platform to arouse the workers for the overthrow of the "Capitalist Imperialists"?

No; they use it for continual attacks on Stalin and the leaders of the Soviet Union. So far from fighting the "Capitalist Imperialists," they are on terms of closest friendship with the most reactionary Tories including the notorious Jew-baiter, Captain Ramsay. The other day, in the House of Commons, Maxton in claiming for his group the place of an Opposition promised not to make any trouble or to make the hard task of the "Capitalist Imperialists" any harder. Socialists! He couldn't understand why Captain Margesson had been removed; he thought he was doing a good job. Now we get this from the chairman of the I.L.P.: "On the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day that we end the British Capitalist-Imperialist systems of violence and robbery, on that day we have earned the right to ask the German workers to revolt against Hitler's oppression and brutality."

Has this anything to do with Socialism? No. It is a glaring case of where the name of Socialism is used to cover up an act of gross desertion. In this instance the desertion of those heroic men and women in Germany who are carrying on the fight against Hitler.

Like Vansittart's chorus of Labour stooges it is a repudiation of Internationalism. When the Russian Revolutionaries were carrying on their heavy struggle against Czarism, did the German workers, the British workers, the workers of all other lands, did they say, We will give them no aid till we've got rid of our own "Capitalist-Imperialists"? Whoever heard of anything so preposterous?

In Germany workers are carrying on the struggle. They don't wait till anyone asks them. They are on the job now, and they want our aid. We can aid them by forcing our Government to make propaganda of a character, based on a statement of policy, that will strengthen the German revolutionaries in their approach to the German people.

But then, of course, according to these I.L.P. "National Socialists," the German workers have no right to appeal to us.

"On the day when they end the German Capitalist-Imperialist system of violence and robbery, on that day, etc."

In the meantime we have no right to appeal to them; they have no right to appeal to us—we isolate ourselves, one from the other, to the delight and advantage of Hitler and the Nazis on one side, and the pro-Fascist Tories on the other.

Lenin firmly declared that the test of anyone claiming to be a Socialist was his attitude to the Soviet Union. These people have been and are the vilest and most unscrupulous enemies of the Soviet Union. *They are not Socialists.*

They were the enemies of the People's Government of Spain, when the Spanish people were battling so bravely against the murderous military machine of Hitler and Mussolini. *They are not Socialists!*

They were the enemies of the people, of Czechoslovakia, and the friends of Hitler when they participated in the betrayal of Czechoslovakia to the German Capitalist-Imperialists and their Nazi thugs. *They are not Socialists.*

"I was proud to be his (Chamberlain's) ally," said this peculiar Socialist! McGovern in the House of Commons. Now they are the enemies of the heroic men and women who are daily risking their lives to carry on the fight in Germany. *They are not Socialists.*

They are the negative of Vansittart's positive. He pours out the venom; they try to prevent the use of the antidote. They both try to achieve the same object—to keep the people of this country isolated from the people of Germany.

They may for a time deceive an unthinking worker here or there, but there is no deception as far as the "Capitalist-Imperialist" Tories are concerned.

They know that the talk of Socialism is a sham. They take the I.L.P. leaders to their ample and corrupt bosoms. They know that all the loud talk has but one aim—to confuse and immobilise the workers and keep them out of the fight against Fascism.

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GUIDE

is prepared each month under R. Palme Dutt's supervision for LABOUR MONTHLY GROUPS and other bodies using LABOUR MONTHLY as a basis for discussion. The Discussion Guide poses a number of separate questions for discussion, and gives references to relevant passages in the current number, with an analytic summary of the points involved.

These Guides are now being used by hundreds of groups and organisations.

Individual readers cut off from political organisations are also taking the Guide. Are you interested?

Annual Subscription 2/-. *Send 2d. Stamp for specimen copy.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turkey and the U.S.S.R.

by QUAESTOR

THE opening of the spring campaign of 1942 finds Turkey in an extremely ambiguous and extremely dangerous position. The whole Turkish people finds itself imperilled by the wobbling and often two-faced policy of the Turkish bourgeoisie. It was the Soviet Union which, in 1919–22, helped the Turkish people to shake off its semi-colonial status, and enter on the path of independent development—albeit as a capitalist State. The Turkish people know that; they also know of the constant political and economic assistance which the Soviet Union gave Turkey in after years. There have been many signs, particularly since 1936, that the Turkish bourgeoisie fears excessive gratitude to the Soviet Union among the Turkish people, particularly the Turkish workers deprived of the right to form free trade unions or their own political party, and the ragged and hungry peasants who are still in an overwhelming majority. These fears were, even before the war, leading to attempts to find some other Great Power to play off against the Soviet Union. Since September, 1939, the preoccupation of the Turkish ruling class with this problem led to violent changes and fluctuations in Turkish foreign policy, which have had a damaging effect on Turkey's international position.

Between September, 1939, and the German attack on the U.S.S.R. at the end of June, 1941, there were already no less than five distinct periods in Turkish foreign policy, turning on whether the Turkish Government judged the situation favourable or unfavourable for anti-Soviet manoeuvres.

The *first* lasted until the spring of 1940. It began with the breakdown of negotiations in Moscow for a Soviet-Turkish Mutual Assistance Pact (October, 1939), because Turkey would not accept full reciprocity. Turkey wanted guarantees from the U.S.S.R. for help against every possible aggressor, without offering the U.S.S.R. similar guarantees. After the breakdown of these negotiations, the Turkish Government pursued a more and more hostile policy, trying to turn the Balkan Entente (the loose understanding of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Greece and Turkey which then still existed) against the U.S.S.R. by means of concessions to Germany, allowing its severely controlled Press to hint at attacks on Russia as the "traditional enemy," and allowing foreign planes to cross Turkish territory in order to carry out reconnaissance flights over the Baku oilfields and their outlet at Batum. This, of course, was during the period when the mistaken policies of Chamberlain and Daladier had brought Britain and France almost to the point of war on the U.S.S.R. The characteristic feature of this phase of Turkish foreign policy was precisely its readiness to try to find common ground with both of the then belligerent camps against the Soviet Union.

In April, 1940, after the crushing defeat of the Finnish fascists by the Red Army, there was a slight improvement in Turkish foreign policy. Without in the least worsening Turkish relations with the two belligerent camps, the Turkish Government and its unofficial spokesmen brought much more clarity into relations with the U.S.S.R. There were official declarations that Turkey desired to co-operate more closely with the Soviet Union in preserving peace in the Near and Middle East, and that the Turkish Government had no wish to involve the Soviet Union in war. This *second* phase lasted only, however, until July, 1940. The dispute which began in that month between the British and Soviet Governments, over the status of the Baltic peoples who had decided to join the Soviet Union, was immediately reflected in Turkish policy.

A *third* phase began, lasting until November, 1940, and marked by a new worsening of relations with the U.S.S.R. As before, Turkish bourgeois politicians attempted to combine this with the friendliest possible relations with both Nazi Germany and Great Britain. British correspondents in Turkey at the time noted that the controlled Turkish Press was treating the Soviet Union as a greater menace to its existence than Germany. When the Nazis began to take advantage of the rift in Anglo-Soviet relations to push their intrigues and their Fifth Columns in key Balkan countries like Rumania and Bulgaria, the Turkish politicians virtually encouraged them by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proclaiming that the greatest danger in the Balkans came from Communism.

Only when this suicidal policy, in the general setting of Anglo-Soviet misunderstandings, found itself face to face with the brutal Italian attack on Greece and the virtual seizure of Rumania by the Germans was there once again a modification of Turkish policy. After the fall of France, Britain was temporarily unable to give material aid to Turkey, and the growing Axis aggression in the Balkans found Turkey with no Great Power to lean on. November, therefore, heard new Turkish declarations of friendship with the U.S.S.R., which became more and more insistent as the months went on, and turned to positive alarm when the German grip was extended to Bulgaria in February, 1941. On March 24, 1941, this *fourth* phase was summed up by a joint Soviet-Turkish declaration of loyalty to the existing pacts of friendship and non-aggression between the two countries, and a pledge of neutrality and full understanding by either party, should the other be attacked.

Yet, on the very eve of the Nazi invasion of the U.S.S.R., there were signs that yet a further wobble in Turkish foreign policy was beginning. A pact of neutrality and a trade agreement favourable to the Nazis were signed with Germany. Simultaneously all kinds of rumours hostile to the U.S.S.R. began to be circulated in Turkish political quarters. Thus, on June 16, 1941 (six days before the German attack), both the *News Chronicle* and *The Times* carried a message from Ankara reporting that, in the opinion of Turkish political circles, the Soviet Union was about to give way to Hitler's pressure, was likely to yield economic control of the Ukraine to Germany, and even would participate in the Nazi "peace conference" stage-show which was then expected to establish the Fascist New Order in Europe.

When these anticipations were made to look foolish by the heroic resistance of the Red Army and the Soviet peoples to the Nazi onslaught, the anti-Soviet elements in Turkish public life changed their methods without altering their objective. So far from renouncing the anti-Soviet tendency which had manifested itself during this last, *fifth*, wobble of Turkish foreign policy, they were emboldened to pursue it further by the widespread expectations at the time—by no means confined to Turkey, of course—that the Nazis would "go through the Red Army as a knife goes through butter." On July 1, 1941, for example, we find *The Times* Istanbul correspondent writing :—

> Political observers notice a Turkish tendency to differentiate and discriminate between the Anglo-German war and the German-Russian struggle. From the outbreak of the war between Great Britain and France and Germany, until quite recently, Turkey's policy as stated by responsible statesmen has been one of non-belligerency. As soon as war broke out between Germany and Russia, Turkey proclaimed her neutrality.

In a further message the same correspondent pointed out on July 9 that the Turkish Prime Minister had taken at their face value, in a Parliamentary session, a flood of German lies about Soviet "offers" to Germany and Bulgaria at the expense of Turkish territory. These revelations, said the correspondent, had "left a deep impression," and he did not hesitate to say that opinion in Turkey was overwhelmingly in favour of a German victory. In fact, of course, he was judging from the tone of the Turkish Press and Turkish politicians, since the mass of the Turkish people had no opportunity to express themselves, either in that sense or in any other.

On July 14 almost the entire Turkish Press attacked Litvinov for uttering a warning, in his broadcast to England, about the fate of small countries who trusted to a pact of friendship with Nazi Germany.

"The anti-Russian campaign is giving the Government some concern," reported the *Daily Telegraph* Ankara correspondent on July 15. But the Turkish Government itself bore a major share of responsibility for the campaign, which it had allowed to grow beyond all bounds. That is hardly to be surprised at, when the Associated Press was in a position to reveal (July 17) that the German Ambassador von Papen had had the assurance to raise with the Turkish Government the question of allowing German troops to pass through Turkish territory to the Caucasus—and that all the Turkish Government could answer was that the question was "premature"!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A sharp and sudden end came to this latest period of illusions about Turkey's ability to play with fire. On July 27, 1941, the Soviet Government handed the Turkish Ambassador in Moscow a series of captured German documents providing irrefutable proof of German plans for the occupation of Istanbul, the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles and other strategic parts of Turkey. This had the effect of stiffening the Turks. By August 2 the *Daily Mail* correspondent at Istanbul was able to report that Turkey would emphatically refuse transit to Italian naval forces into the Black Sea, and would resist if necessary by force. This was enlarged, six weeks later, into an assurance that Turkey would refuse passage through the Dardanelles and Bosphorus to warships or auxiliaries of all but really neutral States (*Daily Telegraph* Ankara correspondent, September 19).

In the meantime, the British and Soviet Governments had gladly responded to the first faint signs of Turkish resistance to Nazi influence. On August 10 the British and Soviet Ambassadors at Ankara had made identical declarations to the Turkish Foreign Minister, pledging their loyalty to the Montreux Convention of 1936, which gave Turkey control of the Straits, disclaiming any aggressive intentions with regard to the Straits or to Turkish territory, and announcing their preparedness "to render Turkey every help and assistance in the event of her being attacked by a European Power." When the Turkish Government showed that it appreciated the stronger position in which it now found itself, thanks to Allied support—by refusing a German demand for the delivery of large quantities of chrome ore, essential for armament production—the Allies in their turn gave Turkey still more encouragement. On December 2, 1941, *The Times* Istanbul correspondent reported that three tankers had arrived from Batum with 25,000 tons of much-needed oil on board, and had been escorted across the Black Sea to the very entrance of the Straits by Soviet warships. This was followed on December 31 by another Soviet tanker of 9,000 tons. Meanwhile, on December 3, President Roosevelt had announced the extension of the Lease-Lend arrangements to Turkey, and it became known that big consignments of howitzers and military lorries had alread been released.

It seemed as though Turkish policy ha every reason now for stability and loyalty But this was not to be. One can only gues that, just as nearer home, certain influ ential people in Turkey, after their alarn at the peril from Germany, were nov beginning to feel disquiet at the Re Army's success. At all events, *The Time* Istanbul correspondent was already re porting before the end of the year :—

> The Turks themselves are breathing mor freely now that the menace from the Caucasu has been removed and the German and Italia forces pushed away from Egypt. A Germa attack on Turkey from Bulgaria is considere unlikely, and information to that effect publishc by the British Press is causing some irritatio here. Thinking perhaps a little wishfully, tl Turks consider themselves immune from dang in that quarter.

And six weeks later (*The Time* February 13), reporting on Turkish Pres comment in connection with the well known speeches of Sir Stafford Cripp the same correspondent wrote :—

> The point which is particularly interesting t Turkey is that which relates to the recognitio of advantages for Russia, and the suggestc occupation of Berlin by Russian troops. Turkis opinion has always been highly sensitive on tl question of Russian expansion, and between tl lines of the guarded comments a creepir uneasiness may be discerned lest the free han for Russia suggested by Sir Stafford Cripp might mean the surrender of the vital interes of neighbouring countries, including Turkey.

The correspondent had already ind cated what Turkish politicians might hav in mind by "the vital interests of neigl bouring countries" when he reported, i his earlier message of December 29, tha according to reports received in Istanbu "in Rumania the people are showing sigr of panic lest further German reverses i Russia should expose their country t invasion by the Red Army."

This is the background on which mu be judged the latest astonishing perforn ance in Turkey—the trial at Ankar which began on April 1, in connectio with an alleged attempt on the life of tl German Ambassador von Papen. Every thing about this affair smells of provoc tion. On the very night of the " attempt (March 5) the Turkish authorities issue a communique stating that foreigne

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were implicated, and that they were suspected to be Communists. A cordon was thrown round the Soviet Consulate, where 50 guests were seeing a Soviet film, and they were kept there till next day without the slightest explanation or apology. Two members of the Soviet Commercial Mission were arrested. On March 11 the Turkish authorities gave it out that a Bulgarian Communist connected with the affair had taken refuge in the Soviet Consulate. When the trial opened, no Bulgarian was produced, but the examining magistrate announced that the two Soviet citizens arrested were definitely implicated in the "plot" against von Papen.

Soviet War News of April 11, in an illuminating article, has revealed that (1) interrogation of the two Turks indicted brought out that neither of them were Communists; (2) they had heard the name of one of the Soviet citizens, Pavlov, for the first time during the investigation; (3) whereas the other Soviet citizen, Kornilov, was supposed to have been met by the Turkish "plotters" at the Soviet Embassy in Ankara in September, 1941, Kornilov was immediately able to prove from the police registers that he had only arrived in Ankara for the first time on January 15–16, 1942. As though to underline the suspiciousness of the behaviour of the Turkish legal authorities in sending such a flagrant frame-up for trial, the court refused Pavlov and Kornilov written Russian translations of the records of the preliminary investigation and the court proceedings—an unheard-of discrimination against foreigners unacquainted with the Turkish language.

It was so obvious from the very outset that an attempt on the life of the German Ambassador, if it were real, could only be intended either to drag Turkey into war with Germany, or to provoke war between Turkey and some enemy of Germany, that the desperate attempts of the Turkish legal authorities to drag the Soviet Union into the case arouses the gravest suspicions as to the whole purpose of the trial. Well might a Tass message (April 6) report that "foreign circles in Ankara express surprise at the anti-Soviet bias of the court and prosecutor." In reality, as we have seen, preceding events link up with such an anti-Soviet demonstration with much consistency. And well might *Izvestia* write, on the same day :—

> Sooner or later the real authors of the Ankara provocation, who now endeavour to cover up their traces, will be exposed and put on trial before the Turkish public. But already the Turkish public is naturally asking the following questions : Who could benefit from the bomb explosion in Ankara ? How could it happen that two honest Soviet citizens would be associated in any way with provocation designed to facilitate for the Germans the task of drawing Turkey into the war, contrary to the interests of the Soviet Motherland ? Is it permissible, from the viewpoint of Turkey herself, that some Turkish circles or other should attempt to pay ransom to the blackmail intrigues and threats of Hitlerite Germany at the expense of the interests of the U.S.S.R. and its citizens ? And will it not yield results directly opposite to those expected by people who tend in this way to appease Hitlerite provocateurs ? We do not doubt that the Turkish public will without any difficulty find the correct answers to these questions.

Equally pertinent was the remark of Lozovsky to a number of foreign Press correspondents at Kuibyshev that "this case has aroused the indignation of Soviet public opinion, which did not expect that the Hitlerites would be allowed to fabricate such provocation in Turkey."

Indeed, it is precisely the fact that they were *allowed* to carry on their criminal work that gives a sinister atmosphere to the Ankara trial. It recalls only too many of the methods of the Nazis at the Reichstag Fire "trial." But the present is a dangerous time to undertake manoeuvres of that particular provocative brand—more especially because of the doubtful diplomatic record of Turkish policy during the last 30 months.

Publications Received

Landmarks in the Life of Stalin by E. Yaroslavsky (Lawrence & Wishart, 5*s*, 192 pp.).
The Balkans Fight for Freedom by Edward Jamieson (Lawrence & Wishart, 1*s*6*d*, 71 pp.).
Bless 'em All by "Boomerang" (Secker & Warburg, 1*s*6*d*, 64 pp.).
A German Protectorate by Sheila Grant Duff (Macmillan, 12*s*6*d*, 296 pp.).
Native Labour in South Africa by Sheila T. van der Horst (Oxford University Press, 18*s*, 340 pp.).
The Economics of Barbarism by J. Kuczynski and M. Witt (Frederick Muller, 1*s*6*d*, 63 pp.).
The Indian Journal of Economics, January, 1942 (University of Allahabad).
The Greatest Swindle in the World by G. Borsky (New Europe Publishing Co., 1*s*6*d*, 78 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jose Diaz

by DOLORES IBARRURI

JOSE DIAZ is dead. . . . It is hard to speak of it, comrades, but still more tormenting to experience this. Our friend, the beloved leader, the great-hearted comrade, has left us for ever. Jose Diaz, the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, is dead. . . . Black crepe envelops the banners of enslaved Spain, which has lost one of its best sons, for the death of Diaz is not only an irreparable loss to the Communist Party of Spain; it encompasses in woe and sorrow the entire Spanish people, which had its interests self-sacrificingly defended by Jose Diaz. There has died not only the Communist Party's first leader; there has died a great fighter for the anti-fascist cause; there has ceased to beat the heart that inspired the heroic resistance of Spain to the Italo-German invaders; there has died one of the chief inspirers of the people's army; there has died a man of iron will who, at the critical moment, succeeded in 24 hours in stirring up the people of Madrid, inflaming them with confidence in their own strength, with confidence in victory, and in leading them off to the front, making the defence of the beloved city a thing that will never die.

When the news of this people's son, so great in his modesty, penetrates to that huge prison which is called Spain, our people, which in the process of heavy struggle has learned to discern the character of individuals, will bow their heads in sorrow. Jose Diaz will not be with them when the day arrives of the liberation of Spain. The people of Spain will not hear his ardent, stirring words on the day of victory. Jose Diaz will not be alongside of other victims, the merciless accuser of the traitors and butchers.

Jose Diaz was a worker, a modest son of the people; by his life and activity he brought no shame on his class or country. At the age of 18 Jose Diaz was already a leader of his trade union organisation, "Aurora," the bakers' union in Seville. During Primo de Rivera's dictatorship Jose Diaz waged a tireless struggle against the dictatorial regime. He was arrested and subjected to such severe prison regime as only the notorious Arlmego was capable of dooming imprisoned workers to. But neither torture nor prison could shatter the faith of the young worker who was to become the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain and an outstanding national figure. Active struggle gradually advanced him to the Communist Party's leadership. At a difficult moment, when reaction furiously persecuted the Communists, Jose Diaz revived the liquidated Party organisations and, in 1932, after the Seville Congress, he was elected General Secretary of the Party.

Jose Diaz was profoundly concerned with the position of the Spanish proletariat, and exerted tremendous efforts as Communist Party secretary to bring about proletarian unity, regarding it as the best weapon of the workers in the struggle against Fascism. But Jose Diaz was not a narrow-minded politician; he understood the need not only of proletarian unity in the ever-sharpening struggle against the fascist and near-fascist reaction, but also the unity of the proletariat and democratic forces for the struggle against the common enemy—fascism.

And Jose Diaz became the driving force of the unification of the democratic forces under the banner of the Popular Front. It can be said that thanks to his persistence the Popular Front was established; in the process of hammering out this powerful weapon in the struggle against fascism, disagreements and difficulties arose which were overcome thanks to the firmness of Jose Diaz. And when anybody considered these difficulties insurmountable, he taught us how to overcome them, always having in view the final aim, and leaving second-rate incidental matters on one side.

In Parliament and at public meetings Jose Diaz constantly directed the attention of the masses to the menace of fascism, and pointed out the path of irreconcilable struggle against this enemy of the freedom of the peoples. But it was in the development of our war of liberation that his great talent as political leader was manifested particularly brilliantly. And this is not surprising. Jose Diaz was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of the people, our heroic people which rose up to the defence, not only of its own liberty, but also the liberty and independence of all peoples threatened by the barbarians, who, having laid Spain waste, are spilling rivers of blood throughout entire Europe.

At the very first moment of the military fascist revolt Jose Diaz proved to the masses that it was not a matter of an ordinary civil war, but of a war of national liberation against the Italo-German aggressors who, thanks to their Falangist agents, were able to enslave Spain. And that is why it was necessary to maintain unity, not only of the anti-fascist forces, but also of all Spanish patriots to whom the independence of the country was dear. Jose Diaz was tireless in pointing out to the rulers the appropriate measures for the development of the struggle with chances for victory : the establishment of the regular army, the organisation of a war industry, and the mobilisation of the resources of the whole country.

Unfortunately his advice was not always taken in time. On the other hand, the people felt that the Party's policy was correct, and that its most authoritative representative was correct and loved Jose Diaz, and had boundless confidence in him.

Jose Diaz's name was indissolubly bound up with the defence of Madrid.

Only the treachery and undermining work of the Fifth Column agents, whom Jose Diaz exposed so often, succeeded in breaking its heroic resistance and transforming Spain into a huge concentration camp. The events which developed after the defeat of Republican Spain showed the profound political intuition of Jose Diaz, who, day in and day out, repeated that the defeat of Spain would not be an isolated fact, but would be the beginning of the direct aggression of Hitler Germany against the entire world. "The security of France is being defended on the Madrid front," once said Jose Diaz in a warning to the French people, and had not the French rulers, long before the collapse of France, pursued a systematic policy of capitulation to fascism, the heroic resistance of the Spanish people would have enabled France to defend itself and maintain its independence.

The experience of events within and without the country has confirmed the profound conviction of Jose Diaz that only on the basis of national unity, on the basis of close unification of all who are desirous of defending the integrity and independence of their native land, can the aggressor be defeated, can the peoples save themselves from fascist domination. Jose Diaz's constant care was Spain, the Spanish people whom he so deeply loved.

Jose Diaz, who suffered from severe illness which made necessary three serious operations, has met on Soviet territory, among the Soviet people, their organisations and leaders, the tremendous love, touching attention and concern which his poor health stood in need of. Soviet science did everything in its power to save its great friend and comrade. In the person of Jose Diaz the Soviet people and its leaders saw the representative of the heroic Spanish people. In the titanic struggle of the Soviet people and the Red Army under the leadership of their brilliant leader Comrade Stalin, and in the forthcoming victory over the Hitler aggressors, Jose Diaz saw the path to the liberation of Spain. But till the last moment of his life Jose Diaz did not cease to assert that the Spanish people cannot passively await their liberation at the hands of the Red Army ; that the Spanish people's historic duty makes it incumbent on it to organise the struggle, basing itself on a wide national unity embracing all the Spaniards who desire to see Spain liberated from foreign tutelage and foreign regime.

And such is the last will bequeathed to our Party and our people by their great leader. Jose Diaz is dead ; but the spirit, firmness and resistance to the enemy, which he succeeded in implanting in us all, lives on. His work remains. The great Communist Party of Spain lives despite fascist terror.

Jose Diaz ! The Party which you moulded and trained, and which is fearlessly fighting inside of Spain, is keeping alive the flame of resistance. It will fulfil your last will by bringing about national unity as the basis of the liberation of our Spain, the Spain to which you devoted the whole of your life to the very end.

PRODUCED 2005 BY ONZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

Heroes of the Atlantic

Heroes of the Atlantic by Ivor Halstead (Lindsay Drummond Ltd., 7s6d).

MR. HALSTEAD HAS done a fine piece of work in following up his "Wings of Victory," in which he told the full story of the valiant courage of the R.A.F., by now paying tribute to the no less sublime courage of the men of the Merchant Navy. Frequently these days we read in the Press of the sacrifice and sufferings endured by the seamen in performing their arduous tasks so vital to the winning of victory over fascism. In this extremely well-documented book is set out the full and inspiring story of the matchless courage, daring, resource and ingenuity displayed by our merchant seamen during the whole course of the war.

The comparisons made of the extent of the hazards at sea endured during the first world war of 1914–18 and those of the present war, which has now spread into almost all the oceans of the world, show that the risks and the dangers which are faced daily by thousands of seamen are *infinitely* greater, more constant and varied than ever before. To the menace of the greater range of the lurking U-boat has been added the even more deadly menace of the dive-bomber and the aerial torpedo.

Those members of the working class who man the nation's life lines have never yet had a square deal from the shipping companies and the Government.

Mr. Halstead reveals that even now it is the practice of many merchant seamen to wear their badge which embodies the letters "M.N.," standing for Merchant Navy, upside down in order to read "N.W."—"Not Wanted," which they feel reflects their true position.

The epic story which Mr. Halstead has written in such a vigorous style should assist in bringing an end to such a scandal. It is a pity that an otherwise extremely excellent book on a much-needed subject should be marred by Mr. Halstead's including the Communist International with German and Japanese fascism in his references to three "ideologies" having as their aim "to get tyrannical control of the world."

D. F. S.

Give Us the Tools

"*Give Us the Tools*." A study of the hindrances to full war production and how to end them. By "Argonaut." (Secker & Warburg, 186 pp., 6s).

THIS BOOK, in its detailed review of the leading industries of Britain in the thirty-second month of war, brings out the confusion in British imperialist economy.

In Britain it is true that heavy industry is gaining power and the leading restriction experts of the last twenty years receive more power and State recognition. In one sense it is a case of the shop stewards versus Lithgow. But Lithgow and iron and steel are not yet all embracing—a tin man rules in the Ministry of Production; a rubber man in the Control of Controllers. We have "the pull and push of rival claimants for the vantage points, the resistance of vested interests to anything that appears likely to upset their particular apple-cart." The mess into which "our financier-industrialists with the rentier jackals massed behind them" have landed us would, as "Argonaut" points out, even if they succeed in their anti-working-class designs, logically lead them to Petainism. Already there are divisions in their ranks, demoralisation and defeatism.

The economic forces behind this situation are revealed in this masterly survey, ranging from exposure of the inanities of sub-contracting and the dead hand of the Treasury (itself a fruit of capitalist policy though they occasionally curse it) to the world-littering collapse of the rentier's Empire, sabotaging of production in India and Canada, and the dividing up of the world with the Nazis at Dusseldorf a month before the war.

"Argonaut" fully describes the cement ring, the machine tool strangleneck, the hard-boiled steel monopoly, the wangling of the aircraft ring, and the reactionaries on the railways and in coal. He deals drastically with the finance bogy. Finance should be the servant not the master of men and production. "It is vital to see war production in terms of real goods." Wages should be at the level of decent living (at present, according to Professor Bowley, apart from income tax more than half the workers are worse off than before the war) and hours at the length of maximum productivity. The "inflation phobes" can go whistle. All this is supported by sound argument and modern instances.

As against this confusion and "immoral certainty" of muddle, profiteering and defeat, "Argonaut" postulates hope: the workers' "drive from below." "Once the workers on the job are really determined to overcome the obstacles right there in the workshops and press forward until they have secured joint responsibility with the managements, then things are on the move."

This unity of the working class has already won certain victories. It can win more. It can become the basis of an organised national production drive, not only giving the necessary higher output but real national unity for victory in 1942. It is the practical organised form of mass pressure at the place where it hurts, for success in a thousand detailed reforms, allied with all genuine anti-fascists, clearing obstacles to the common people's will to win.

LEN POWELL.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q[illegible]S [illegible] [illegible]

THE April Discus[illegible] prepared [illegible] LABOUR MONTHLY *Discussion Groups* put the following questions:—

On the eve of [illegible] to the British Government? [illegible] is the evidence [illegible] in [illegible] questioning in [illegible] circles [illegible] co-ordination [illegible] the Soviet [illegible] the freedom [illegible] in an anti-fasc[illegible] democratic [illegible] the German people? [illegible] with India? [illegible] proposals [illegible]

Those who discuss[illegible] such questions gained more from LABOUR MONTHLY than those who read [illegible] Join a Group or start a Group, NOW!

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GROUPS

Places in **BOLD TYPE** are new Groups. Places in *italics* are projected Groups.

PLEASE SEND STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE FOR PARTICULARS

LONDON AREA

Acton, **BETHNAL GREEN**, **BURNT OAK**, *Chelsea*, Chiswick, Clapham, Clapton, East Ham, Edmonton, Finchley, Forest Gate, Fulham, Golders Green, Greenwich, Hampstead, Hampstead Garden Suburb, Hanwell, Highgate, Holborn, Lambeth, Leyton, Marylebone, North Kensington, Palmers Green, Putney, South Kensington, **SOUTHFIELDS**, Southwark, Walthamstow, Wandsworth, Wembley, Westminster, Willesden, [illegible]

HOME COUNTIES

Addington, Amersham, *Ashford (Kent)*, Ashtead, Banstead, Barking, Beaconsfield, Beckenham, Bishops Stortford, Braintree, Bromley, [illegible], Bush Hill Park, **CAMBRIDGE**, Caterham, *Cheam*, [illegible], **CROWTHORNE**, [illegible] *Green*, *Croydon*, *Dartford*, [illegible], Epsom, [illegible], Gravesend, Grays, **GREENFORD**, [illegible], Hatworth and Feltham, **HAROLD WOOD**, Harpenden, Harrow, Hertford, [illegible], Hemel Hempstead, Heston, Hillingdon, Hitchin, Hornchurch, [illegible], Maidenhead, **MORDEN**, North Harrow and Rayners Lane, Northolt, [illegible], St. Albans, [illegible], Slough, *Staines*, [illegible], Wallingford, Walthamstow, Waltham Cross, Watford, [illegible], Woodford

PROVINCES

Abercynon, Aberdeen, Abertillery, **ALFRETON** and **RIPLEY**, **ALDERSHOT**, Altrincham, Ardrossan, Ayr, Bacup, Barnstaple, Barrow-in-Furness, [illegible], Bath, [illegible], Birkenhead, Blackpool, Blyth, **BOGNOR**, **BOSTON**, [illegible], Bristol, [illegible], Burnham, Bury, **CAITHNESS**, [illegible], **CASTLEFORD**, Cheadle, Cheltenham, Chester, [illegible], **CHORLEY**, [illegible], **COCKERMOUTH**, [illegible], Fawley, Fleetwood, *Folkestone*, Glasgow, [illegible], **HEBBURN**, Hereford, [illegible], **HUYTON**, [illegible], Liverpool, Llanelly, *Llandudno*, [illegible], Mansfield, Marple, Merseyside, [illegible], Nelson, Netley, Newark, New Mills, Newcastle-on-Tyne, [illegible], Nuneaton, Paisley, Penrith, Perth, Peterborough, [illegible], **PRESTON**, [illegible], Preston, Rawtenstall, Reading, Renfrew, Renton, [illegible], Rugby, *Rushden*, [illegible], St. Helens, *Saffron Walden*, Salisbury, [illegible], **SPEKE**, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent, *Stornoway*, Stroud, Sunderland, Swindon, [illegible], *Taunton*, Tonypandy, Tonyrefail, Tunbridge Wells, Walsall, Wareham, Warrington, [illegible], Wednesbury, Westbury, Weston-super-Mare, *Whitstable*, Winchester, [illegible], Wolverhampton, Woodbridge, Worcester, Worksop, Worthing, Wrexham, Yarmouth, Yeadon, Yeovil.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This edition over-subscribed before date of publication

LANDMARKS IN THE LIFE OF STALIN

by **Yaroslavsky**

The AUTHORITATIVE biography

192 pages **Eight plates** **5/- net**

★ ★ ★

LAWRENCE & WISHART

LABOUR MONTHLY WAR PAMPHLETS

Reprinting:

REVOLT IN EUROPE, by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P. 6d.

JAPAN, by R. PAGE ARNOT .... 3d.

Ready shortly:

ORGANISED DISCUSSION .... 2d.

—a treatment of the problems of building a Discussion Group and the methods of organising and conducting fruitful discussion in the light of two years' experience. 16 pp.

For single copies, please add 1d. postage in each case. Reduced rates for quantities of 12 and over. Please write for terms.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED